



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Boston Public Library

IRISH 1798 COLLECTION

The Irish Ecclesiastical Record

A Monthly Journal under Episcopal Sanction

VOLUME V

JANUARY TO JUNE, 1915

FIFTH SERIES

DUBLIN

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LIMITED, NASSAU STREET

1915

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BX1503
.A1 I7
Vol. I

Nihil Obstat :

TERENTIUS O'DONNELL, S.T.D.,
Censor Dep.

Imprimi potest :

✠ GULIELMUS,
*Archiep. Dublinen.,
Hiberniae Primas*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME V

ARTICLES

	PAGE
Abstinence, Total	281
By Very Rev. John T. Murphy, C.S.Sp.	
America, Irishmen as Teachers in	513
By R. J. Kelly, K.C.	
Armagh, Primate Reginald of	498, 606
By Rev. M. H. MacInerny, O.P.	
Attention, The Psychology and Physiology of	569
By Rev. T. E. Flynn	
Canon Law. (<i>See under section 'Notes and Queries.'</i>)	
Catechism, The Teaching of	53
By a Missionary Priest	
Catholic Church and Art, The : The Development of Painting in Italy	384
By Rev. E. A. Foran, O.S.A.	
Catholic Church in 1914, The	1
By Very Rev. James MacCaffrey, S.T.L., P.Dh.	
Catholic Disabilities, The Viceroyalty and the	373
By Frank MacDonagh	
Concordat of 1801, Dr. Hussey, Bishop of Waterford, and the	337
By Very Rev. P. Boyle, C.M.	
Consanguinity	346
By Rev. David Barry	
Denifle, Heinrich Suso, O.P., Historian	460
By Prof. J. M. O'Sullivan, M.A., D.Ph.	
Descartes	163
By Rev. J. Byrne O'Connell, Ph.D.	
Dublin, George Browne, First Protestant Archbishop of	269
By W. H. Grattan Flood, Mus.D., K.S.G.	
Eschatological Sermon, The Kingship of Christ and the	238
By Rev. F. Rota, S.J.	
France, Religious Revival in	225
By Very Rev. A. Walsh, D.D., O.S.A.	
God's Ways and Thoughts, Glimpses of	561
By Rev. William A. Sutton, S.J.	
Irish Intermediate Education Act, 1878, The	16, 126
By Rev. Peter Byrne, C.M., LL.D.	
Jansenism, Some Landmarks of	449
By Rev. Father Alfred, O.S.F.C.	
Liturgy. (<i>See under section 'Notes and Queries.'</i>)	
Louvain, Some Inscriptions from	205
By Shane Leslie	
Mental Hygiene	625
By Christopher Reddin, B.A.	

	PAGE
Missionary Life, Pioneer, in the North-West	251
By 'Peregrinus'	
Monsieur Among the Mushrooms: A 'Modern' Philosopher at Large	586
By A. Newman	
'Ne Temere' Decree in England, The Working of the	258
By Rev. Christopher Sweeney, O.P.	
Nietzsche, Friedrich, Some Aspects of	363
By Rev. P. O'Keeffe, M.A.	
Religious Experience, Notes on the Psychology of	183, 475
By Prof. John Howley, M.A.	
Responsories of the Office, The	39
By Rev. M. Eaton, B.D.	
Revolution of '82, The	145
By Michael MacDonagh	
Socialism: A Critical Analysis	113
By Rev. John O'Grady, M.A.	
Theology. (<i>See under section 'Notes and Queries.'</i>)	
War, The, and Divine Providence	28
By Right Rev. John S. Vaughan, D.D., Bishop of Sebastopolis	

CONTRIBUTORS

ALFRED, REV. FATHER, O.S.F.C.—Some Landmarks of Jansenism	449
BARRY, REV. DAVID—Consanguinity	346
BOYLE, VERY REV. P., C.M.—Dr. Hussey, Bishop of Waterford, and the Concordat of 1801	337
BYRNE, REV. PETER, C.M., LL.D.—The Irish Intermediate Education Act, 1878	16, 126
EATON, REV. M., B.D.—The Responsories of the Office	53
FLOOD, W. H. GRATTAN, Mus.D., K.S.G.—George Browne, First Protestant Archbishop of Dublin	269
FLYNN, REV. T. E.—The Psychology and Physiology of Attention	569
FORAN, REV. E. A., O.S.A.—The Catholic Church and Art: The Development of Painting in Italy	384
HOWLEY, PROF. JOHN, M.A.—Notes on the Psychology of Religious Experience	183, 475
KELLY, R. J., K.C.—Irishmen as Teachers in America	513
KINANE, REV. J., D.C.L.—Canon Law	71, 301, 418, 528, 642
LESLIE, SHANE—Some Inscriptions from Louvain	205
MACCAFFREY, VERY REV. JAMES, S.T.L., D.Ph.—The Catholic Church in 1914	1
MACDONAGH, FRANK—The Viceroyalty and Catholic Disabilities	373
MACDONAGH, MICHAEL—The Revolution of '82	145
MACINERNEY, REV. M. H., O.P.—Primate Reginald of Armagh	498, 606
MISSIONARY PRIEST, A—The Teaching of Catechism	53
MURPHY, VERY REV. JOHN T., C.S.Sp.—Total Abstinence	281
NEWMAN, A.—Monsieur Among the Mushrooms	586
O'CONNELL, REV. J. BYRNE, Ph.D.—Descartes	163
O'DOHERTY, REV. T.—Liturgy	78, 308, 425, 536, 649
O'DONNELL, REV. M. J., D.D.—Theology	62, 295, 411, 519, 635
O'GRADY, REV. JOHN, M.A.—Socialism: A Critical Analysis	113
O'KEEFFE, REV. P., M.A.—Some Aspects of Friedrich Nietzsche	363
O'SULLIVAN, PROF. J. M., M.A., D.Ph.—Heinrich Suso Denifle, O.P., Historian	460
'PEREGRINUS'—Pioneer Missionary Life in the North-West	251
REDDIN, CHRISTOPHER, B.A.—Mental Hygiene	625
ROTA, REV. F., S.J.—The Kingship of Christ and the Eschatological Sermon	228

CONTENTS OF VOLUME V

V

	PAGE
SUTTON, REV. WILLIAM A., S.J.—Glimpses of God's Ways and Thoughts	561
SWEENEY, REV. CHRISTOPHER, O.P.—The Working of the 'Ne Temere' Decree in England	258
VAUGHAN, RIGHT REV. JOHN S., D.D., Bishop of Sebastopolis—The War and Divine Providence	28
WALSH, VERY REV. A., D.D., O.S.A.—Religious Revival in France	225

NOTES AND QUERIES

Theology :

By Rev. Prof. M. J. O'DONNELL, D.D.

Absolution of Accomplice	411
Banns, Excusing Causes from the Law of	300
Christmas Day, Masses on	63
Confessions of Nuns and Sisters	637
Conscription—Our Duty to the State	524
Contrition Formula, The Act of	416
Delegate, Power of the Parish Priest to	300
Delegation, A Question of	416
Delegation of a Curate in a Matrimonial Case	299
Dispensation Cessation of	414
Emigrants, The Needs of	528
English Law, Formalities of	295
Extreme Unction, Repetition of	635
Fast and Abstinence, Law of	62, 295, 525
Funeral Offerings	67
Heretics, Administering Sacraments to	520
'Honoraria,' Two, on the same day	414
Implicit Intention	67
Marriage, Invalidity of	641
Marriage Laws, A Case under the New	64
Marriages between Persons of different Denominations in Ireland	417
Nine Fridays, The Devotion of the	295
'Paroecia sua,' Meaning of	67
Quasi-Domicile, Acquisition of a	67
Quasi-Domicile, Loss of—A Case under the 'Ne Temere' Decree	296
Recovery of a Gift	519
Restitution, Case of	62, 640
Roman Law, Citations from	521
Rubrical Matters, Some	520
Sick, Administration of Holy Communion to the	413
Sponsors, Admission of Non-Catholics as	637
Trading Interest	519
Vespers and Compline, Anticipation of	69

Canon Law :

By Rev. Prof. J. KINANE, D.C.L.

Bishop's Power to Dispense outside his Territory	422
'Cathedraticum,' The	306
Dismemberment of Parishes and Missions	418
Grave Fear an Excusing Cause from Censure	71
'Honorarium' for Bequest Masses, The	73
Irish Martyrs, Introduction of the Cause of the	528
Jurisdiction, Effects of Suspension from	530
Letting of Pews and Graves	420
Mass 'pro populo'	301
May old Churches be used for Profane purposes?	304
Novitiate, A recent Decree of the Congregation of Religious regarding the	76

NOTES AND QUERIES—*continued*.

Ordination, Testimonial Letters for	532
Prayer Books, Imprimatur for	306
Purgatorial Masses	74
Repressive Punishment, Necessity of Canonical Admonitions before the Infliction of	642
Residence of Parish Priests	645
Statutes of Provincial Synods, Power of Bishops to Dispense from the	646

Liturgy :

By Rev. T. O'DOHERTY.

Altar Stone in which there are no Relics, Mass on an	536
Banners in a Procession of the Blessed Sacrament	311
Ciborium, Purification of the, in peculiar circumstances	312
Communion in a Mass 'Coram Sanctissimo,' and before a Requiem Mass during Paschal Time	649
Communion in a Nun's Cell a short distance from the Altar	311
Cope, Colour of the, when Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is given after Mass	314
Ejaculation 'My Lord and my God' during the Elevation: May the Indulgence be gained by the Celebrant? Is he allowed to utter Pious Aspirations after his Communion?	539
Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, The Versicles and Responses after the 'Te Deum' sung during	425
Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, Where should the box for the Lunette be placed during?	311
Holy Saturday, Private Mass in a Convent Chapel on	538
'Kyrie,' The, in certain Masses	649
Lessons for the Octave of the Solemnity of St. Joseph	649
Marking the Host with the Paten	82
Mass to be said for a Deceased Priest 'in die obitus seu depositionis'	310
Motu Proprio 'Abhinc duos annos,' The	78
Oratio Imperata in a ferial Mass when a Prayer for the Dead has been inserted	425, 652
Oratio Imperata 'pro re gravi,' The	308
Orationes Imperatae, Omission of the second of two	425
'Ordo' difficulties	314
'Panem de coelo' at Benediction, Who may Sing the?	649
Prayer for the Dead in a ferial Mass, No obligation to say a, even to gain the Indulgence of a Privileged Altar	425
Prayer 'A Cunctis' in England, The	430
Prayers after Mass	651
Relics of a Portable Altar disturbed: Does it lose its Consecration?	536
Requiem Mass, The Epistle and Gospel in the	310
Reverences to be made by a Priest before the Altar of Exposition, or a side Altar where Mass is being celebrated?	649
Scapular Medals for the Army and Navy	309
Stole and Biretta, Use of the	429
Stole, Colour of the, when Communion is given 'extra Missam'	651
Temperance and Total Abstinence Societies, Indulgences for	428
Tone of Voice when giving Communion	82
Village Stations, Blessing of Holy Water and 'Asperges' at	314

CORRESPONDENCE

'Meat Wines'	654
By Rev. P. Coffey	
Preservation of Parochial Records, The	83
By C.C.	

DOCUMENTS

	PAGE
Africa, Declaration regarding the Recitation of a certain Prayer for the Conversion of	217
Allocation of the Holy Father at the Consistory of January 22, 1915	545
Apostolic Indulgences attached to Rosaries, Crosses, Crucifixes, Little Statues and Medals, Renewal by Pope Benedict XV of, and the conditions of attaining them	317
Calendar to be followed in a certain Metropolitan Church, Doubt as to the Certain Prayers 'tempore calamitatis' are enriched with an increased Indulgence	661
Collect 'pro re gravi' prescribed by a Bishop, Doubts regarding a	320
Dedication of a new Cathedral, Letter of Benedict XV to Dr. Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul's, Minnesota, on the Occasion of the	316
Episcopal Revenues, case of, accruing during the vacancy of the See, decided by the Congregation of the Council	662
Græco-Ruthenian Church in the United States of North America, The Spiritual Administration of the	656
Index of Prohibited Books, Certain Works are put on the	323
Indulgences granted to those Devoting themselves to Jesus Christ by a certain ejaculatory Prayer	665
Inscriptions and Arms of Bishops, Decree prohibiting the Use of Secular or Family Titles and Devices in the	437
Irish Bishops, Statement and Resolutions of the (January 19, 1915)	664
Irish Martyrs: Decree of Beatification or Declaration of the Martyrdom of the Servants of God, Dermot O'Hurley, Archbishop of Cashel; Cornelius O'Devany, of the Order of St. Francis, Bishop of Down and Connor; Terence Albert O'Brien, of the Order of Preachers, Bishop of Emly, and their Companions	209
Italian Emigrants, Letter of Benedict XV to the Bishops of America concerning the Spiritual Care of	438
Lessons for Feasts of the Universal Church, Approval of, which in some places are only Commemorated	659
Mass in Private Houses, Doubts regarding the Power of Ordinaries to permit the Celebration of	543
Mass 'pro populo,' Doubts concerning the	660
Offices in particular Calendars, Decree concerning the nature of the Approval granted to	315
Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Vulgate, Motu Proprio of Benedict XV concerning the	541
Pope Benedict XV: The Election of	321
— Anniversary Days in his Life	84
— Autograph Letter of, to his Eminence Cardinal Logue in reply to the Message of Congratulation on his Elevation to the Papacy, sent by the Irish Bishops	84
— Reply of the Cardinal Secretary of State to a Message sent by Right Rev. Mgr. Hogan, D.D., on behalf of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth	85
— Exhortation of, to the Catholics of the World	87
— First Encyclical Letter ('Ad beatissimi') of	88
— Grants and Privileges granted by, to the Priests who attended the Cardinals during the Conclave that Elected him to the Papacy	89
Prayers of a certain Mass and the order of Precedence in the Distribution of Holy Communion, Doubts regarding the	214
Presumption of Death in Matrimonial Cases, Two Decisions re the	544
Priests who Emigrate to certain countries, Declaration in reference to the Decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation concerning	548
Religious Novices, Decree regarding the Interruption of their Studies by Roman Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas, Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Studies in reference to the Statutes of the	217
	552
	553

Rubrics of particular Offices and Masses, Certain Doubts regarding the, solved by the Congregation of Rites	542
Sodalities instituted to promote the Reading of the Gospel, Indult regarding the Indulgences granted to	321
United States, The Charity of the Catholics of the, towards the Afflicted People of Mexico—Letter of Benedict XV to his Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, in Praise of	663
War, The : Decree of Pope Benedict XV appointing Sexagesima Sunday (February 7, 1915) as a Day of Expiation and Intercession in all European Countries	212
— Pope's Prayer for Peace, The	213
— — Indulgence of 300 days granted to all who devoutly recite the	434
— Blessing of Pious Objects for the use of Soldiers during, An Extension of the Faculty of	435
— Confessions of the Faithful during, The Faculties of Chaplains of Soldiers to hear the	433, 543
— Holy Communion and the Celebration of Mass in Camp during	436
— Masses celebrated for the Repose of the Souls of those who died during, The Privilege of Altar is granted for all	434
— Medal-Scapulars, The power of Blessing, for the use of Soldiers is granted to every Priest during	216
— Prisoners of, The Clergy are ordered by the Holy Father to be mindful of the Spiritual and Temporal Comforts of the	431
— Sacramental Absolution of Soldiers ordered out to Battle, The	435

REVIEWS AND NOTES

'Archivium Hibernicum, or Irish Historical Records,' 107; 'Beata Bpéanoan,' 447; 'Book of English Martyrs of the Sixteenth Century, A,' 670; 'Catholic Moral Teaching and its Antagonists,' 333; 'Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Bible, The,' 221; 'Church and Usury, The,' 105; 'Conferences for Boys,' 335; 'Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, The,' 218; 'Frequent Communion,' 671; 'Fruit of the Tree, The,' 334; 'George Washington, The Life of,' 666; 'Golden Legend, The—Lives of the Saints,' 442; 'Gospel of Nicodemus and Kindred Documents, The,' 667; 'History of England, The,' 555; 'History of Ireland, The' (Keating), 445; 'History of the Catholic Church from the Renaissance to the Revolution,' 102; 'Irish Corpus Astronomiæ, An,' 446; 'Leaves from three Ancient Quarans possibly Pre-Othmanic,' 559; 'Life and Writings of St. Columban, The,' 443; 'Memorials of Robert Hugh Benson,' 671; 'New Testament Documents, The—Their Origin and Early History,' 111; 'Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Office for the Dead, and the New Office for November 2,' 666; 'Official Record of the National Catholic Total Abstinence Congress and All-Ireland Demonstration, 1914,' 104; 'Outside the Walls,' 334; 'Parables of the Gospel, The—An Exegetical and Practical Explanation,' 332; 'Pre-Reformation Scholars in Scotland in the Sixteenth Century,' 669; 'Philosophy of Faith, The,' 220; 'Popular Sermons on the Catechism,' 329; 'Pulpit Themes: Adjumenta Oratoris Sacri,' 560; 'Rambles in Catholic Lands,' 557; 'Short Sermons for the Children's Mass,' 336; 'Short Sermons on the Gospels,' 336; 'Spiritual Instruction for Religious,' 335; 'Sunday Gospels Explained to Children, The,' 334; 'Theory and Practice of the Catechism,' 335; 'What of To-day?' 330; 'Within the Soul—Helps in the Spiritual Life,' 223. Books, etc., received, 112, 224, 336, 448, 560, 671.

SOCIALISM

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

By REV. JOHN O'GRADY, M.A.

It goes without saying that no mere delusion or hope of an Icaria or New Atlantis, where equality and peace will reign supreme, could have attracted the large number of men who have been drawn to Socialism during the past fifty years. There must be something very bad in our present system or very attractive in Socialism when such large numbers revolt against the present system; when they are prepared to discard it and substitute in its place the system proposed by Socialism. The capitalistic system must have some serious flaws when it causes such a revulsion of human thought and feeling; when such a large group of men scattered all over the world can find no words too strong to express their condemnation of it. But the criticism of the present order is not confined to socialists alone. The note seems to have been taken up by some of society's most conservative leaders. They, too, have been aroused from their 'dogmatic slumbers' and have begun to realise that all is not well with us, and that this great world-wide socialistic movement has some foundation in the industrial life of our time. The motives, however, which inspire the socialistic and conservative indictments of the present order are essentially different. The conservative makes his indictment to stir up the public conscience, so that men may realise the dangers and the excesses of uncontrolled capitalism and take the necessary steps towards reform and wholesome government regulation. We, conservatives, believe that the resources of the

present industrial system are not yet exhausted ; that capitalism is not yet bankrupt, and that it can be modified and changed and thus made subservient to the wants of society at large. When a socialist of the Marxian type fulminates his criticism against capitalism, he merely does so to express his despair. Capitalism, he thinks, is rotten to the core. It has seen its day ; it has done fairly good service in the past, and no matter how you may attempt to reform it, you cannot avert its final doom. The socialist is convinced that there can be no peace or harmony so long as capitalism lasts, for he believes that all evils, both moral and physical, are directly traceable to this monster of iniquity. ‘Why,’ they ask, ‘have we so many jails, so many poor houses, orphan asylums ; why do so many young girls give themselves up to the oldest trade in the world ? Why has Europe turned itself into an armed camp and why are its peoples over-burdened with taxation ? Whence all the poverty that is offering such problems to modern society ? Why is it that a few persons have appropriated all the resources of the world while the multitude must be satisfied with the bare necessities of life ?’ We trace these defects of our system, in so far as they are real defects, to a multitude of causes ; but in the imagination of the socialist they all centre around capitalism. Wars are waged, they tell us, and standing armies maintained, to protect and extend the power of capitalism. The poor are the victims of capitalistic exploitation. Industrial panics are due to over-production, brought about by the competition of capitalists for the market.

Whether this radical criticism is sound or not is well worth looking into ; for it has seized the imagination of thousands, has forced them to give up their confidence in our political leaders, has made them despair of the present system, and it is still capable of doing infinite damage among our working-classes. The socialists are ever active ; they centre their attention on places where workmen are dissatisfied, where there is no union to protect them, where they are forced to work long hours for a mere subsistence

wage. They appeal to these dissatisfied workers; they tell them the cause of their suffering, and they hold out to them the hope of a bright future. What wonder if the imaginations of many are captivated by the message of Socialism?

The criticism of the present order which has been made both by socialists and non-socialists alike is, thank God, compelling us to make a searching examination into existing institutions. It is forcing us to ask ourselves seriously whether we have not been living in a fool's paradise; whether we have not, unconsciously perhaps, been placing property rights above human rights; whether our civilisation has not, after all, been built on an un-Christian basis. And as we begin to examine the matter seriously many of us are liable to receive unpleasant shocks, for we shall discover many things of which, in our economic security, we never dreamt. An illustration will give us an idea of the economic theory which has dominated men's minds for over a century and of the temptations to which owners of large industry are exposed. Let any one of our readers fall heir to a hundred thousand dollars in the morning. What will he do with it? Evidently he will seek the opportunity of investing it to good account, and having invested it, he will use every means to secure the highest profit on it. He will press on managers for dividends; he will induce them to cut down expenses, which may mean a cut in wages. If this fortunate individual had been living in England or Germany fifty years ago, no social farce would have prevented him from securing the highest competitive profit. The Government would not have interfered with him in the least, for it was convinced that if such an individual were allowed to work out his own economic salvation, the good of all would be better secured. The Governments, in other words, were under the spell of natural liberty. In America this doctrine of natural liberty, or *laissez faire*, seems to have lasted longer than in any European country. We can see evidences of it still in the persistent opposition to social legislation and

in many of our court decisions declaring such legislation unconstitutional. American legislators have been slow to break into profits even for the sake of protecting human rights, and when they did so their action has, time and again, been declared unconstitutional by the courts.

But a great change is coming over us. The State is not trying to get on the saddle and control the industrial horse. It is now endeavouring to interfere with the industrial process in order to defend human rights. Let us come back again to the fortunate individual with the hundred thousand dollars, to see what a difficult task the State has before it. This man, whose principal object is profits, is naturally opposed to all State interference. Social reform he looks upon as a mad attempt to oppose the working of economic laws and as most detrimental to industry. He will try to influence the legislature by every reasonable means against the passing of social legislation, and if the laws should pass, he can still secure the best legal talent to question their constitutionality in the courts. Even after they have passed through the court unscathed, there is still a hope of influencing the factory inspector. But the owner of a hundred thousand dollars, you may think, cannot, of himself, offer very strong opposition to the passing of social legislation. No; but we must remember that his power does not lie in his own efforts; his power is the power of organised capital. Most large owners of capital in America are at one with our friend in his opposition to State interference, with what they call 'the legitimate development of industry.'

Against this great highly concentrated industrial system Socialism directs its trenchant criticism. And not only does it criticise but it analyses and dissects: it tells us whence the present system came and whither it is leading; it traces industrial institutions back to their very origin in human nature; it describes their rise and development, and it pursues them into the future, predicting their decay. This socialistic criticism first assumed a scientific form in the hands of Karl Marx. Before his time the socialists

were, for the most part, mere Utopian visionaries; they assumed that uncritical attitude toward historical institutions that was so characteristic of eighteenth-century thinking. They believed that all social institutions were due to the dishonesty and oppression of the past, and that it only required a campaign of enlightenment to induce men to cast off these institutions. Marx, trained as he had been in Hegelian dialectic, was not satisfied with the criticisms of the Utopians, and hence he cast about for a different foundation on which to build his system. This he found in the doctrine of class struggle, supplemented by the doctrine of surplus value.

Let us see how Marx makes use of these two principles in explaining the present social and industrial order. Large scale production is the great characteristic of the present time. Our friend with his hundred thousand dollars does not, as a general rule, start a business of his own nowadays. He unites his capital with the capital of other men, and it goes to the building and furnishing of large cotton factories or large steel plants, as the case may be. These large plants put the smaller manufacturers, whom we shall represent by Jim Jones and John Smith, out of business, for the large factory can produce better and cheaper goods than Jones and Smith are capable of producing. The result is that Jones and Smith must go and offer their services to our friend, or some other large owner. The tools which they made use of in their little industries have been relegated to the scrap-pile; and if they wish to avoid starvation they must enter the large factory and offer their services. Now Jones and Smith are typical of a class, and our friend with the hundred thousand dollars is typical of another class. To the class of Jones and Smith belong all modern workmen; all those armies which every morning are brought together in our factories by the sound of the whistle, there to engage in uninviting and monotonous toil until the evening whistle bids them depart. To the class of our friend belong the factory owners. The interests of these two classes, according to Marx, are naturally antagonistic.

The owners of capital desire large profits, which can only be secured by exploiting these labourers. The labourers revolt against this exploitation, and hence we have the deadly struggle, in which the labourer is continually worsted. Our friend, the man of ordinary business mentality, Marx would say, exploits Jones and Smith; there is a struggle, but Jones and Smith are continually worsted. But the same struggle which is taking place between capitalists and labourers is also taking place among the capitalists themselves. Our hundred thousand dollar capitalist is not only trying to exploit Smith and Jones, but is also trying to outdo other capitalists. He will beat out the others in the competitive struggle if he is a stronger and better business man than they, and in the end will acquire complete control over the industry in question. The same process will go on all over the industrial field, and consequently the number of capitalists will grow fewer and fewer until our hundred thousand dollar friend, with a few others, control the whole industry of a nation. And as the number of capitalists becomes fewer, the number of labourers increases, and these conditions become gradually worse until they are no longer bearable. Then shall the workers revolt and overturn the capitalistic system.

But how comes it, we may ask the disciple of Marx, that the modern capitalist is able to exploit his workmen? The Marxian will answer that the exploitation takes place through the appropriation of surplus value. Let us recall once more the example of the hundred thousand dollar capitalist to see what he means. This man, let us say, owns a cotton factory, with all the appliances necessary for the turning of raw material into the finished product. Smith and Jones, with a large number of others who are in the same condition, must come and offer their services to him, or starve. He pays them the ordinary market-rate of wages which, according to Marx, is the amount barely sufficient to enable them to live and to reproduce their kind. But their labour is worth much more than this. It is equivalent to the whole value of the manufactured

produce. Therefore, if our hundred thousand dollar friend wishes to do justice to his workers he must, according to the socialist, distribute among them the full price received for the cotton, merely retaining the equivalent of his own labour time. He has no right whatever, according to the socialist, to receive anything in return for the capital that he has invested, and anything which he does receive from it, by way of return from it, represents robbery and exploitation of the workers. Accordingly, when our hundred thousand dollar friend receives an eight per cent. dividend on his investment every year, the socialist would say that he is reaping where he has never sowed, that he is growing rich on the labour of others.

With regard to the Marxian idea of class struggle, we may say that at the present time there is undoubtedly such a thing as class struggle; but this struggle is not so intense or far-reaching as Marx would have us believe. There are many other social and religious forces in the world counter-acting this struggle which Marx overlooked. He saw the struggle in England when it was at its worst, when young children were brought into the factories and forced to labour under the most inhuman conditions; when parishes eased themselves of the burden of supporting pauper children by farming them out to the factory owners, and when the free labourer received a mere starvation wage. Here Marx saw the class struggle at its worst; he saw the stronger class impose upon the weaker a yoke that was little better than slavery itself. We can easily understand how he could have generalised his thrilling experiences in England, and supposed them to be true of all times and places.

But Marx's general conclusion was not justified by his premises. He overlooked the humanitarian instincts of the English people, which soon found a remedy for the evils of their industrial system. This, indeed, is one of the fundamental weaknesses of Socialism. It overlooks all that idealism and Christian charity which will not permit the stronger class to oppress the weaker. As soon as the public mind becomes conscious of the evils of unregulated

capitalism, its Christian charity and humanitarian feeling quickly devises a remedy for them. These nobler instincts of the race, inspired by Christian teaching, have found expression in the many organisations which have been created in recent years to improve the condition of the weaker members of society, such as the National Consumers' League and the National Association for Labour Legislation. Organisations such as these have done much towards changing the attitude of employers towards their employees. They have in many instances convinced employers that low wages, long hours, and harsh treatment do not give the best results, and if they have not succeeded altogether in putting an end to the class struggle, they have certainly raised it to a higher plane. Underlying and permeating the Marxian theory of class struggle was a materialistic philosophy, into which we cannot enter at present—for the obvious reason that it would take a whole article, or perhaps a series, to treat it adequately. This much, however, may be said in passing. According to Marx, the economic struggle gave rise to and determined the nature of all social and religious institutions. There was, therefore, for him no other fundamental force in life save the purely economic. Religion, according to Marx, was a sort of idealism, which developed in course of time and afterwards became a strong weapon for the oppression of the weaker classes by the stronger. It is, therefore, not far to see why there should be antagonism between Marxian socialism and religion.

Concerning Marx's idea of surplus value, of exploitation of labour, and of the gradual deterioration of the working-classes, it may be said, in the first place, that it is based on a false principle, namely, that the capitalist has no right to a return on his investment. Does not our friend with the hundred thousand dollars confer a benefit on society by saving his money and investing it in industry? Take away the hope of profit and you deprive him of the greatest incentive to saving. And if you deprive this individual and the other ambitious members of society

of the greatest incentive to saving there will be a decrease in the amount of capital flowing into the channels of industry, with a consequent decline in industrial production. Secondly, Marx's theory has been falsified by the experience of the past fifty years. Everybody knows that the contrary of Marx's expectations has been realised. The condition of the labourer has been greatly improved during these years. His pay-check has been increased, his hours of labour shortened, and the general conditions of his work rendered more bearable.

Many modern socialists, realising that the Marxian doctrines are without foundation, and that his prophecies have not been fulfilled, have given up faith in Marx. They believe that one may be a good socialist without slavishly following Marx. They believe that a system of socialised industry will ultimately take the place of the present competitive system. The days of competition, they tell us, are numbered ; capitalists are now realising the waste of competition, and are uniting in order to cheapen the cost of production, to regulate output, to control prices, and thus secure a higher profit. The tendency towards concentration in all lines of industry, they tell us, is every day becoming more marked, and ere long there will be no place for small industries in our system. The Government, according to the socialist, is powerless against these giant industrial corporations that have been formed in obedience to economic laws. It cannot dissolve them, and even if it could, its policy would be uneconomic. It cannot regulate them, for they are too powerful. Its only alternative, then, is to take them over, by degrees, as it realises its inability to control them. The Government, of course, will not need any profits, and the difference between the large sum which now goes to profits and the small sum required to discharge the Government's indebtedness to the present owners of capital, will be distributed among the workers, each receiving according to his merit. Now, the first question which a consideration of this socialistic scheme suggests is : are the feats of recent industrial development

such as they are portrayed by the socialist? Is there a tendency toward concentration in industry, towards the ownership or control of wealth by a few men? Secondly, what about the system of Government ownership and operation which Socialism offers as a substitute for the present competitive system?

In answer to the first question, it may be said that the socialist is partly right and partly wrong when he emphasizes the tendency towards industrial concentration. That there is a tendency towards concentration along certain lines we freely admit, but the tendency is by no means so universal as the socialist would have us believe; and in many instances, where concentration has been effected, there was no economic justification for it. It was brought about by a few financiers for the purpose of enriching themselves by stock manipulation. So long as concentration is due to desire of a better and cheaper product it is economically justifiable. When, however, large corporations become detrimental to the economic welfare of society, then it becomes the duty of the Government to dissolve or regulate them as it sees fit; and the fact that the Government has been so far unsuccessful in bringing them under control, is no proof that its powers have been exhausted.

Indeed, taking all the facts into consideration, the tendency towards concentration in modern industry is far from being as great as the socialist would have us believe. In agriculture, the tendency has been all the other way. There has been a notable increase in the number of small farms during the past ten years. In the field of distribution the number of large stores has increased, but there has also been an increase in the number of small stores. In manufactures the number and proportion of goods turned out by large factories has increased during the past decade, yet the increase has not been so great as to warrant us in believing that large factories are going to take the place of smaller ones, along all lines. In spite of the increase of large factories more than fifty per cent. of the

manufactured products of the United States is still produced by small factories. Again, concentration of industry is very different from concentration of ownership. A large part of the stock in our manufacturing establishments and railroads is owned by persons of limited means.

With regard to the substitute which the modern socialist would offer in place of the present capitalistic system, it may be said in all fairness that its adoption would be an extreme measure, and why should we have recourse to such an extreme measure before we have tried out the possibilities of the present order? The present social order is far from being bankrupt. It is capable of infinite variation and of adapting itself to its everchanging environment. There is no genuine evil in the present system traceable to capitalism which society cannot remedy, it being understood, of course, that it cannot change the earth into a paradise. Society can take care of the problem of low wages, both through the agency of the State and trade unions. Much has been done in this matter by trade unions, both in England and America, during the past fifty years, and what has been done by them in the past is merely a sign of the greater things which they are capable of doing in the future. Much has also been done by legislation to improve the condition of the labourer. Much has also been done by the State to improve the workman's condition, through minimum wage laws, workmen's compensation Acts, insurances, regulation of the sanitary conditions of factories, laws regulating the hours of work, and, finally, through old age pensions.

In the face of all this real and possible improvement in the present system there is evidently no good reason at present for adopting complete State ownership and operation of industry. Such a system would give rise to worse evils than those that exist under the present system. It would remove one of the greatest incentives to private enterprise; it would, therefore, not be liable to bring out the finest qualities of the race. What private enterprise is doing for us it would turn over to the large unwieldy

machinery of the State. It would bring politics into the whole industrial order. The amount of wealth to be produced as well as its distribution would become a political issue, and it is very doubtful if the amount to be distributed among the workers would be appreciably greater than under the present system. Socialists themselves admit that wages could not be increased beyond the present rates without an increase in production. Indeed, the present class struggle is only child's play compared with the struggle for the spoils of industry that would begin with the new socialistic era.

But, whatever may be said in criticism of Socialism, one thing we must all admit: Socialism has aroused us from our complacent slumbers. It has opened up to us the great evils of the present order, it has pointed out to us the great monster, Capital, riding roughshod over human rights. It has forced us to analyse capitalism, to separate the good from the bad in it, and to impose upon it those restraints which make it subservient to human rights.

The more we refuse to take heed of and apply a remedy to the evils that give rise to Socialism, the more it will grow. No amount of argument, no amount of denunciation, is going to stop the spread of this great radical movement, so long as our institutions fail to do justice to the working-classes. If we are to combat Socialism with the most effective weapons, we must attack the evils which give rise to it. We must modify our notions of property, and we must realise that property is a sacred trust held and exercised subject to the interests of the community at large, that this right of property must be so regulated as to give all the members of society an opportunity of attaining the higher ends of human life.

Sad experience has told us that competition has failed to secure the advantages of private property for a large section of our population. In the competitive struggle large numbers have been unable to acquire that sufficiency of life's goods to which they are justly entitled, and for

the evident reason that many are too weak or too lacking in ambition to engage successfully in the competitive struggle. It is the duty of society to supplement, through legislation, the weaknesses of such persons. It must provide our skilled workers with means necessary to maintain their present standards of living, and the unskilled workers it must provide with the means of advancing their present low standards. The main reason why so many families of skilled workers have been impoverished in the past, or have descended to the conditions of the unskilled, was the death or disablement of the bread-winning member brought about by industrial accidents. The best means so far devised by Governments of helping such families to maintain these standards is by workingmen's compensation laws.

It is also the duty of the State to see that the unskilled workers get a living wage, that they are not compelled to work for excessively long hours and under conditions prejudicial to their physical or moral well-being. These objects can be attained through minimum wage boards, laws regulating the hours of work and the sanitary conditions of factories, and, finally, by industrial education. Such measures, when supplemented by workingmen's compensation and State insurance, ought to do much towards improving the condition of our unskilled and propertyless population, thus making them less susceptible to the wiles of socialistic agitators.

JOHN O'GRADY.

THE IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION ACT, 1878

BEFORE AND AFTER

BY REV. PETER BYRNE, C.M., LL.D.

II

THE LAUNCHING OF THE ACT

THE Irish Intermediate Education Act became law on the 16th of August, 1878.

As provided by the Act, seven Commissioners were at once appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. They were: Lord Chancellor Ball, Chairman; Lord O'Hagan, Vice-Chairman; Lord Belmore, Chief Baron Palles, Rev. Dr. Salmon, Provost of Trinity College; The O'Connor Don, and Mr. James P. Corry, M.P. The two Assistant Commissioners were the Rev. Dr. Molloy,¹ afterwards Rector of the Catholic University, and the Rev. Dr. Porter, afterwards President, Queen's College, Belfast.

The situation thus created meant a new departure in the educational life of Ireland. Hitherto each school

¹ The writer of this paper is informed by his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin that amongst those nominated in the first instance to constitute the Board of Intermediate Education was Dr. Molloy, then Vice-Rector of the Catholic University.

The letter of the Duke of Marlborough, who was then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, asking Dr. Molloy if he would accept the nomination, is in the possession of the Archbishop. Dr. Molloy accepted the nomination, but before the appointments of the Commissioners were officially made, he had been offered, and had accepted, the position of Assistant Commissioner, a position in which it was felt that, at all events during the period of organisation of the new system, he could, with his unique capacity for the special work to be taken in hand, be far more usefully employed in the interests of education than he could be as a member of the Board.

In the short interval before Dr. Molloy's appointment to the Assistant-Commissionership, the position had been offered to the present Archbishop, who, however, declined the offer, preferring to remain in the Vice-Presidentship of Maynooth, to which he had been appointed two or three months before.

worked by itself and for its own pupils. Neither teachers nor pupils had any thought of, or direct concern for, what was being done in other schools. Now a totally new system was to be introduced, compliance with which was necessary if a school wished to have any share, either for the school as a school, or for its pupils, of the money provided by Parliament under the Intermediate Education Act. The period of transition from the old system to the new, especially in the case of the Catholic schools, was naturally a period of doubt and uncertainty. There was danger that much time might be wasted in groping for information. The most experienced among the Head Masters soon realised that the crisis called for common counsel, for a discussion of the difficulties to be faced and of the manner of meeting them. But, to accomplish this, organisation was required, and no existing organisation was available.

Fortunately for Irish Catholic schools, the present Archbishop of Dublin had just been appointed Vice-President of Maynooth. He had always taken a deep and practical interest in education. He at once grasped the bearings of the situation, saw the necessity of prompt action, and decided to propose to the Catholic Head Masters the meeting of a conference at Maynooth. In the circular letter which brought about the conference he outlined in advance to the Head Masters the four objects to be aimed at in their deliberations :

First: Mutual communication and interchange of ideas, as regards—

- (a) Methods of teaching,
- (b) The best school-books to use,
- (c) The special training required in preparing students for examinations on the system which, they might expect, would be adopted by the examiners under the new Board.
- (d) The changes which it might be advisable to propose to the Bishops, so as to harmonise the entrance examinations in Maynooth and the examinations under the Intermediate Board.

Secondly : The careful consideration of the Schedule of Rules appended to the Act, with a view to possible amendments, to be brought under the notice of the Intermediate Board.

Thirdly : The formation of a Standing Committee to serve as a medium of communication between the various schools and colleges, and to act as their mouthpiece in negotiating with the Intermediate Board.

Fourthly : The establishment of communication between our Catholic schools and colleges on the one hand and the leading Catholic publishers of school-books on the other.

The note of practicality thus sounded in the circular governed the proceedings of the Conference, which met on the 8th and 9th of October. Similar action, including the appointment of a Standing Committee, was taken by the Protestant Head Masters. This twofold organisation did not come a day too soon. The two Standing Committees lost no time in securing a meeting with the two Assistant Commissioners, to discuss the Programme of Examinations for the coming year, 1879.

To devise and inaugurate a complete scheme for examining the intermediate schools of a whole country, including, of course, the framing of a programme of studies in each subject, was an undertaking requiring much thought and well-balanced judgment. It could not be accomplished without some knowledge of what the Irish schools were already doing, as well as what they might be expected to do, in accordance with the recognised standards aimed at in similar schools in other countries. All this meant labour and study. Time was limited. Barely four months were available if the first examinations under the Act were to be held in 1879. Owing, however, to the good-will and unceasing efforts of the Assistant Commissioners, and to the expert knowledge and advice placed at their disposal by the two Standing Committees, the programme of the examinations for 1879, as well as the rules governing the examinations, were issued on the 16th December, 1878.

This enabled the school authorities to make all necessary arrangements as to books and courses, and the grading of their students, before the end of December, so that the classes were in a position to begin their work under the new system immediately on the return of the students in January.

The succeeding months before the examinations were months of hard work, both for masters and students. To the masters, and in a lesser degree to the students, they were months of anxiety, and this was the case in a peculiar manner with Catholics.

Little more than half a century had elapsed since Irish Catholics, from their own slender resources, began to open intermediate schools in any number. The masters in these schools, with rare exceptions, were untried men—men without university studies or degrees. On the other side—in competition with them—Protestants had large endowments, their schools were supposed to have a long tradition of scholarship, and their masters, as a body, were graduates of Dublin, or of the Queen's, University, many of them with a distinguished university record. No wonder that the Catholics were anxious about the issue to be decided at the coming examinations. For the first time, the work of their schools was to be tested by outside and independent examiners, and this, in open competition with Protestant schools, enjoying the advantages just mentioned. The odds seemed to be against their holding even a good second place.

So much was this supposed to be the case that many friends of the Catholic schools, and those even well informed, considered that the result of the contest was a foregone conclusion. Indeed, shortly before the examinations began, the *Freeman's Journal* had a friendly leading article preparing the public for the non-success of the Catholics; and pleading for leniency of judgment if their schools were found to fall considerably below the Protestant schools. On the appearance of this article, the Chairman of the Standing Committee¹ of Catholic Masters, the present

¹ The only surviving members of the Standing Committee of 1878 are the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Ballarat (Dr. Higgins), Father Delany, S.J., and the present writer.

Archbishop of Dublin, wrote a letter to the *Freeman's Journal*, in which he declared, in plain but courteous language, that the Catholic Masters asked for no special consideration or indulgence from the public when the time came for judging of their work. They were prepared to abide by the results of the examinations, and to be judged on them.

In what he said the Archbishop voiced the feelings of the great body of the Masters, and the event justified both him and them. When the results of the examinations were published, on the 16th of September, 1879, it was found that the Catholic schools had fully held their own.

Looking at the lists of schools, as tabulated by the newspapers of the time in order of merit, according to the totals of exhibitions and prizes gained by each, and taking the first six schools for boys for the years 1879, 1880, and 1881, we find that three were Catholic and three were Protestant. The order was :—

1879	1880	1881
French College, Blackrock	French College, Blackrock	French College, Blackrock
St. Stanislaus' College, Tullamore	Royal Academical Institution, Belfast	Royal Academical Institution, Belfast
Royal School, Armagh	St. Stanislaus' College, Tullamore	St. Stanislaus' College, Tullamore
Royal Academical Institution, Belfast	St. Vincent's College, Castleknock	Royal School, Armagh
St. Vincent's College, Castleknock	Royal School, Armagh	St. Vincent's College, Castleknock
Academical Institution, Coleraine	Wesley College, Dublin	High School, Harcourt Street, Dublin

The success achieved by the Catholic schools in 1879, as compared with the Protestant schools, has hitherto been uniformly maintained, and generally acknowledged. Indeed, the one unmixed advantage of the Intermediate Act, in the opinion of some, has been to establish the fact—a fact never questioned since 1879—that the education given in Irish Catholic schools, taken as a whole, is, to say the least of it, in no way inferior to that given in Protestant schools.

FINANCE

The Intermediate Act provided that the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland should, out of the funds accruing under the Church Act of 1869, pay to the Intermediate Board a sum not exceeding one million sterling. The income from this sum was originally £32,500, but, owing to the reduction of the rate of interest on the National Debt in 1888, it fell, after that year, to £27,500.

Experience soon proved that the income thus provided was quite insufficient, if the number and amount of prizes and exhibitions, and the results payments to managers of schools, as laid down in the Schedule of Rules appended to the Act, were to be maintained. As early as 1882 the two Standing Committees, Catholic and Protestant, of Head Masters took counsel together, as was their practice on occasions of importance, and agreed to present a Memorial to the Chief Secretary, Mr. W. E. Forster, and to ask him to receive a deputation.

The following were the chief points in the Memorial :—

The Memorial of the two Standing Committees of Head Masters of the Intermediate Schools in Ireland humbly sheweth that the new rules issued by the Intermediate Education Board for 1882 are a great departure from the scheme drawn up by the late Government and sanctioned by Parliament. The vast reduction in the scale of pecuniary awards, both for students and schools, has gone far to defeat the object intended by the Act. The new scale proposed will inevitably either involve unendowed schools in a considerable loss, or force them to abandon the scheme which was otherwise calculated to do so much good. Moreover, the students will be seriously discouraged by the great diminution, both in value and number, of the exhibitions and prizes held out to them. On the faith of these rewards, both schools and students were aroused to considerable exertions, and conceived great hopes, in which they are now threatened with the greatest disappointment.

The deputation was a large and representative one, and was received by Mr. Forster on the 24th of January, 1882.

It had been arranged that speakers representing both Standing Committees should address the Chief Secretary. Dr. Molloy,¹ in introducing the deputation, emphasized the

¹ Dr. Molloy had resigned his position as Assistant Commissioner in 1879.

fact that the Bill was originally intended only for boys, and that Earl Cairns had declared, on the 2nd of July, 1878, and again on the 4th of July, that 'should Parliament at any time be disposed to extend the system to them [girls] the financial arrangements would require enlargement.' He reminded Mr. Forster that the scales of payment for exhibitions and for results to schools were specifically contained in the Schedule of Rules approved by Parliament, and, therefore, the members of the deputation were simply asking Parliament, through the Government, to provide means for carrying out its own Act.

Father Delany followed. He stated that the practically universal opinion of the schoolmasters was, that the Act might be regarded as a great success. Criticism there had been, but it had been from outside and not from the schoolmasters. The prizes and exhibitions provided under the original scheme were not only a great inducement to boys, but they afforded schoolmasters, generally in parts of the country where it was most needed, a chance of giving a very clever boy in the lower middle class, or even in a lower class still, an opportunity of placing himself in the position which his intellect and talents fitted him for, but to which the circumstances of his life gave him no opportunity of lifting himself. His success would be calculated to make others around him also value education, and would thus help to place education on a basis that it had never before occupied. By the new rules results fees would practically be reduced 25 per cent. and exhibitions 33 per cent. He pressed home several other points in support of the argument of the Memorial, and concluded by saying that the new rules, if persevered in, would lead to the abandoning of the system altogether by many schools.

Mr. Houston, speaking for the Presbyterians and other Nonconformists of the North of Ireland, said that, after the passing of the Act, intermediate schools had been established in almost all the small towns in Ulster, in the expectation that the scheme would be carried out on the original lines. If these were departed from, many of the

new schools would probably go down. Mr. Hogan spoke in the same sense for the South of Ireland and Mr. Wilkins for Dublin. Dr. Parker, of Belfast, said that he had about a hundred girls under his charge, and that the effect of the Act on their education had been marvellous. There had been an immense advance in solid education.

Mr. Forster said many plausible things in reply, but held out no hope of an increased grant. He pointed out that it was essentially a matter of money, and he told the deputation that it was to the Chancellor of the Exchequer they should have gone. He added, in reference to the implied pledge of Earl Cairns, 'that the House of Commons was the guardian of the public purse and voted money, and the Bill was passed in the House of Commons for boys and girls, with a certain sum fixed, and the House of Commons was, therefore, not pledged in any way in the House of Lords.'¹ But, though the deputation failed to move Mr. Forster, the question was not allowed to drop out of sight.

Under the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act of 1890 it was provided that the Irish share of the Customs and Excise duties payable in any year to the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account, should be applied (*a*) as to the amount of £78,000, for the purposes of primary education, and (*b*) as to the residue, for the purposes of intermediate education. This made a substantial addition to the original grant, but the addition had the drawback of varying from year to year. In 1911 the Treasury substituted for this variable addition a fixed annual sum of £46,500. This, added to the interest on the original grant, gave a permanent income of about £80,000 a year.

To this £80,000 must now be added Mr. Birrell's grant of £40,000, which was secured to the Intermediate Board by a short Act passed on the 10th of August, 1914. The rules for administering this grant were to be made by the Lord Lieutenant and approved by the Treasury. They were to be laid before both Houses of Parliament, so as to be subject to public criticism.

¹ *Freeman's Journal*, January 25, 1882.

Meantime, one outstanding fact remains, that a further annual sum of £40,000 passes into the hands of the Commissioners of Intermediate Education, bringing the total amount to be administered by them up to £120,000 per annum.

RESULTS OF THE WORKING OF THE ACT

One unquestionable result of the working of the Intermediate Act, already alluded to, has been to explode, once and for all, the fable that the Protestant schools of Ireland stood on a superior level of their own. It is hard for those who were born within the last fifty years to realise how widely accepted this supposed superiority was in the middle of the last century. It was indeed acquiesced in by the majority of Catholics themselves.

Those whom business or inclination led to inquire into the actual facts of the case thought differently. They knew, of course, that the few clever boys of the best Protestant schools, who had in view the sizarships, exhibitions, scholarships, prizes, and ultimately fellowships of Dublin University, naturally worked up to a high standard, and that their masters worked with them; but they knew also that the teaching of the average run of boys in those schools left much to be desired. To set public opinion right upon a matter of this kind was a benefit to the whole community; and the setting right, as far as one can judge, would have been slow in coming were it not for the Intermediate Act. So much for this, the first result of the Act, which may be termed extra-educational, because it arose in great measure from the special social circumstances of Ireland in the past.

EDUCATIONAL RESULTS

To judge of the educational results of the Act two questions have to be answered:—

1. Is the number of boys and girls receiving intermediate education greater than before?
2. Is the intermediate education they receive of a higher quality?

Public statistics furnish an answer to the first question. Table 40, on page 60 of the General Report of the Irish Census Commissioners for 1911, gives, for each of the census years from 1881 to 1911, the number of pupils receiving instruction in 'Superior Establishments' in Ireland, distinguishing the number belonging to each religious body. The heading 'Superior Establishments'¹ is used as distinguished from 'Primary Schools,' and may, therefore, be taken as applying to intermediate schools. The following are the figures :—

Attending Superior Establishments	1881	1891	1901	1911
Catholics	12,064	15,430	25,647	31,742
Protestant Episcopalians	7,854	7,280	7,335	6,220
Presbyterians	3,063	3,342	3,638	3,580
Methodists	775	787	1,011	848
All other Denominations	937	930	934	747
TOTALS	24,693	27,769	38,565	43,137

The main fact standing out from this table is, that the number of pupils receiving intermediate education rose from 24,693 in 1881 to 43,137 in 1911. Considering the falling off in the population during the interval, this increase appears to be satisfactory, and credit for it may fairly be given to the Intermediate Act.

Another fact that strikes one in connexion with this table is, that while the number of Catholics receiving intermediate education increased considerably from 1881 to 1911, the corresponding number of non-Catholics, strange to say, diminished.

NUMBERS RECEIVING INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION

	Catholics	Non-Catholics
1881	12,064	12,629
1911	31,742	11,395

The statistics contained in the Reports of the Commissioners of Intermediate Education are also instructive.

¹ The Census Commissioners, in a note on page 58 of their Report, state that in their tables a school in which a foreign language is taught is classed 'Superior' as distinguished from 'Primary.'

Taking the same four census years—1881, 1891, 1901, and 1911—we find the following figures :—

NUMBERS EXAMINED UNDER THE INTERMEDIATE ACT

	Boys	Girls	Total
1881	5,147	1,806	6,953
1891	3,856	1,300	5,156
1901	5,829	2,288	8,117 ¹
1911	7,963	4,142	12,105 ¹

These figures show that the increase in the numbers presenting themselves for the intermediate examinations from 1881 to 1911 are, relatively, about the same as the corresponding increase, shown by the census returns, in the total numbers attending Irish intermediate schools.

A closer inspection of the statistics of the Intermediate Reports establishes the satisfactory fact that the increase in the numbers examined in the highest, or senior, grade is substantially in the same proportion.

The following table groups the three sets of figures together :—

	Numbers receiving Intermediate Education	Numbers examined at the Intermediate examinations	Numbers examined in Senior Grade
1881	24,693	6,953	540
1911	43,137	12,105	920

The apparent discrepancy between the numbers receiving intermediate education and the numbers examined at the intermediate examinations is accounted for (1) by the fact that there are intermediate schools which do not present their pupils for the intermediate examinations; (2) by the fact that even in schools whose pupils are prepared for the intermediate examinations a large proportion, sometimes more than one-half, are excluded from examination, owing to age, health, or other causes; (3) by the rule of the Intermediate Board, which does not recognise as eligible for examination any pupil who enters school after the preceding 1st of October.

¹ These totals, for 1901 and 1911, include pupils who were examined in the Preparatory Grade. The examination in this Grade has been discontinued.

We get upon more debatable ground when we come to answer the second question: Is the education given in Irish intermediate schools of a higher quality since 1878 than it was before?

General agreement as to the answer there is not. Ever since the days of Roger Bacon there have been discussions, and often keen criticism, as to the relative value of different subjects as matter for study and education. Irish intermediate education has been no exception in this respect.

For the purpose of this paper, a sufficient answer to the question may be gathered from the evidence given by the late Lord Justice FitzGibbon before the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Commission of 1898-99. Lord Justice FitzGibbon was a man of brilliant parts, who had exceptional experience in educational matters. He was a member of two Commissions on Endowed Schools in Ireland, and was a Commissioner of National Education. He was also a member of the governing bodies of two intermediate schools in Dublin. His opinion, therefore, carries great weight.

In the course of his evidence he defended the system of examinations in general, saying that 'the only known test that exists anywhere in any school, public or private, or in any college or university, to find out whether children have been well taught or not, is examination'; and supporting his opinion by the words of the late Sir Joshua Fitch, that 'individual examination unquestionably acts as a safeguard for thoroughness and exactness, and as the best measure of a scholar's progress' (QQ. 2593, 2596). He spoke of the 'absolute confidence there is in the intermediate system of public examinations' (Q. 2537). He stated that the Intermediate Act had been successful in making education 'more efficient' than it had been (Q. 2604).

But it was under Questions 2596, 2597, 2598 that his evidence was most valuable. He said that, in the course of inquiries in connexion with the 'Educational Endowments

Act Commission, 1885-1896,' he and Dr. Molloy (both were members of that Commission) were anxious to devise some test of the value of the intermediate examinations, in order to meet the objections of some managers of schools who refrained from sending up pupils for the intermediate examinations on the ground that the system 'was not good enough.' 'Good sound teaching,' they said, such as would prepare for Trinity College or the Royal University, was what they wanted. With a good deal of trouble the Commissioners got a list compiled of every student who obtained an entrance exhibition or a sizarship in Trinity College from 1885 to 1898, and of every student who obtained an entrance exhibition in the Royal University during the same period, distinguishing in all cases those who had studied under the intermediate system from those who had not.

The results are set out in detail in a series of very instructive tables on pages 14 to 41 of the Appendix to the Final Report, Part II, of the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Commission of 1898-99. The total number of entrance exhibitions and sizarships gained in Trinity College during the fourteen years, 1885 to 1898, was 315, and of these, 258 were gained by students who had studied under the intermediate system. In the Royal University, during the same period, the number of entrance exhibitioners was 433, and of these, 412 had studied under the intermediate system.

The names of the 748 exhibitioners and sizars are given, and the detailed record of the intermediate successes is shown in the case of each student. The exhibitioners, both of Trinity College and of the Royal University, are arranged in order of merit; and, comparing this order of merit with the detailed record of intermediate successes, it is remarkable how closely the places occupied by the exhibitioners on the list of the universities correspond with the places occupied by the same men on the intermediate lists.

The following table, taken from page 42 of the Appendix,

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION ACT, 1878 139

gives a summary of the tables containing the detailed information :—

SUMMARY FOR THE ENTIRE PERIOD, 1885-1898

	Total 14 years			Total 14 years	
	Inter- mediate Students	Not Inter- mediate Students		Inter- mediate Students	Not Inter- mediate Students
Trinity College Exhibi- tioners	204	25	Royal University Ex- hibitions, Class I.	136	6
Sizars not Exhibi- tioners	54	32	Royal University Ex- hibitions, Class II.	276	15
	258	57		412	21

Trinity College—Percentage of Exhibitioners who were
Intermediate Students 89·2

Trinity College—Percentage of Exhibitioners and Sizars
who were Intermediate Students 82·8

Royal University—Percentage of First Class Exhibitioners
who were Intermediate Students 95·8

Royal University—Percentage of First and Second Class
Exhibitioners who were Intermediate Students 95·3

These figures and percentages prove one thing : that, whatever the defects of the intermediate system, it has, according to the best available tests, done much to raise the general standard of education in Irish schools. This is no small point to have to its credit, when there is question of an annual examination of 8,000 or 10,000 pupils.

THE VICEREGAL COMMISSION OF 1898-99

This notice of the beginnings of the Intermediate Education Act and its first results would be altogether incomplete without some mention of the Irish Intermediate Education Commission of 1898-99. It was a Viceregal Commission, appointed to 'inquire into and report upon the system of Intermediate Education in Ireland as established by the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act, 1878, and into its practical working; also as to whether any reforms or alterations of the present system are desirable,

and if so, whether further legislation is necessary for carrying them into effect.'

Two things distinguish this Commission from most other similar Commissions. First, that it was appointed on the unanimous request of the Intermediate Commissioners themselves. Secondly, that although, as was afterwards made known, the Intermediate Commissioners had suggested to the Lord Lieutenant, Earl Cadogan, the appointment of some outsiders as members of the Viceregal Commission, the Intermediate Commissioners themselves, and they alone, were constituted by his Excellency the members of it.

This may appear to some like appointing the members of a Board to inquire into and report on their own work. This was not so. There was question, not of the administration of the Act, but of defects in the Act itself.

The Commissioners of Intermediate Education had, in fact, in their administration of the Act during the few preceding years, finally come to the conclusion that there were serious shortcomings in the Act, as it stood. Chief among these were the absence of any provision for an efficient system of inspection, the method of allocating the money provided by Parliament, the tendency of the system of examinations to encourage over-pressure and undue competition among the pupils, and especially among the younger pupils¹ of the different schools.

To remedy these shortcomings fresh legislation might be necessary, and before such legislation could be pressed for, fuller information was required for the Government, for the Commissioners themselves, and for the general public. A public Commission of Inquiry was the natural means of obtaining this fuller information, hence the appointment of the Viceregal Commission.

It was constituted on the 30th of May, 1898.

Circular letters, with schedules of queries inviting criticism or suggestions, were issued in July to about 1,000

¹ The particular defect here referred to was largely the result of the introduction into the system in 1890 of a new 'Grade,' known as the Preparatory Grade, without any modification of the system of examination set up in the rules embodied by Parliament in the Intermediate Act of 1878.

persons, who were interested, either directly or indirectly, in Irish education. The answers to these circular letters were appended to the first Report made to the Lord Lieutenant by the Commissioners on the 23rd of December, 1898, and so were accessible to the public. During the sittings of the Commission sixty-four witnesses were examined. They included twenty-six Head Masters or representatives of intermediate schools, as well as Fellows and Professors of Trinity College, Members of the Senate and Fellows of the Royal University, some of the higher officials of the English and Scotch Education Departments, and other important witnesses. The final Report, embodying the recommendations of the Commissioners and accompanied by a verbatim report of the evidence given, was presented to the Lord Lieutenant on the 11th of August, 1899.

Thus was concluded, within the short space of fifteen months, the work of an important Commission, dealing with the whole system of intermediate education in Ireland ; and, like every similar Commission, dealing with it in such a way as to make the general public confidants of the Commissioners, both in regard to the information laid before them, and the recommendations founded on that information. It was a matter of general knowledge, that the initiation of the Commission and the carrying of it to a successful issue were largely due to two of the Commissioners, one of whom was the Archbishop of Dublin, who had become a member of the Intermediate Board in 1892.

Whatever happens in the future, the proceedings of the Viceregal Commission of 1898-99 may well be counted as the opening up of a new era in the history of the Irish Intermediate Board and its work, and as a valuable asset of Irish intermediate education.

THE FUTURE

Defects there are in the intermediate system as there are in every other system, and room for improvement. The greatest defect, in the opinion of the present writer, lies in the competition between pupils of different schools

for exhibitions and prizes. Valuable exhibitions and prizes there ought to be; but competition for them should be confined to the pupils of the same school. Only through the adoption of some such plan as this will professors be encouraged to teach at their best, because they will think only of the subject and the best way of teaching it. At present they are under the temptation of thinking how the examiners, perhaps three or four in number, may consider how the subject ought to be taught.

Of course there may be difficulties in carrying out the plan, but they should not be insurmountable. Indeed, the members of the Intermediate Education Commission suggested a way of carrying it out.¹ In Part IX of their Final Report they propound a scheme of a 'Prize Grant' for each school, the grant to vary in amount according to the success of the school at a general pass examination of the pupils of the intermediate schools of Ireland, and to be expended on exhibitions and prizes to be competed for by the pupils of the school among themselves. The value of the exhibitions and prizes should be approved by the Intermediate Board, and the arrangements for this prize examination should be, in the last resort, under its control.

Another defect, the present writer ventures to think, is to be found in a system of dual control that has got a footing in our intermediate schools, apparently on the plea of co-ordination.

Co-ordination is one thing, dual control quite another. Co-ordination is beneficial and much to be desired. It aims at linking together the different branches of education—primary, technical, intermediate, and university—so that all may work in harmony towards a common end, while each branch retains its independence, and alone controls the schools working under it. In practice, it secures that

¹ The effort made by the Intermediate Education Commissioners to have a Bill passed by Parliament empowering them as Commissioners of Intermediate Education to give effect to the recommendations made by them in the Report of the Viceregal Commission, failed. An Amending Act was passed in 1900, but it gave only a limited power of carrying out some of the proposed reforms.

a lower branch of education is made to lead to a higher, so that a promising pupil, well taught in the lower, may pass on with profit to the higher. Co-ordination ends there. It leaves the controlling authorities in each branch to look after the school work of that branch. That is not dual authority. It is very far indeed removed from dual authority, which exists only when the authorities of one branch of education have a controlling voice in the schools of another branch, which are already working under the authorities of that other branch. This means, in practice, that such schools are working under two different authorities. In other words, they are trying to serve two masters, and we have high authority for holding that such service cannot be successful.

A dual authority of this kind, many think, is being exercised in some intermediate schools; and, in connexion with it, results payments of an unusual kind are made, not payments for each pass at an examination, but payments for so many hours of instruction per week in certain subjects. This, to an outsider, is very like buying the time of the school for certain subjects. As the school time in every school is limited, it follows that the more of it is bought for certain subjects the less of it remains for other subjects, especially when these latter are under the control of a department whose administrators have not recourse to this new system of payment.

Finally, there has been the defect arising from the absence of inspection.

Section 3 of the Act of 1878 made provision for inspection:—‘The Assistant Commissioners shall also act as secretaries, and, when required, as inspectors.’ The latter part of this section, providing for inspection, remained inoperative for thirty years, owing to the simple fact that the Assistant Commissioners could not be in two places at the same time. The Commissioners had, again and again, approached the Government for authority to appoint inspectors *ad hoc*, but it was not until 1909 that the Treasury

agreed to the appointment of inspectors, whose whole time would be devoted to the work of inspection. The number was at first only four. At present it is eight. Thus the Commissioners of Intermediate Education are now brought, as they should have been from the beginning, into contact with the schools through their inspectors, as well as through the marks of their examiners, and so one of the most serious defects in the system has in great measure come to an end.

CONCLUSION

Turning from the history of the past and the present, the friends of intermediate education in Ireland have no reason to regard the future with misgiving. The progress made during the last thirty years has been satisfactory, and will bear comparison with the progress made in most other countries. That progress has been made while Irish Catholics were without a teaching university. Is it too much to hope that, with the National University in full working order as a teaching body, and silently but effectually exercising its educational influence mainly upon our Catholic schools, as Trinity College does upon Protestant schools, the whole system of intermediate education will improve more in the future even than it has improved in the recent past?

PETER BYRNE, C.M.

THE REVOLUTION OF '82

By MICHAEL MacDONAGH

THE heart must be cold that is not thrilled, and the imagination sluggish that is not uplifted, by the story of how Ireland won her legislative independence in 1782. The Parliamentary agitation of the Patriot Party for the abolition of Poynings' Law, and the consequent freedom of Irish legislation from the strangling grip of the English Attorney-General, which had continued through many long and disheartening years, culminated in 1782 in the avowal or affirmation, carried unanimously on the motion of Henry Grattan in the House of Commons—backed as it was by 80,000 armed volunteers, self-raised, unpaid, and independent of the Government—that no power on earth, save the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland, was competent to make laws binding upon the Irish people. Legislative effect was quickly given to the declaration by the repeal of Poynings' Law. To complete the severance of Ireland's bonds, the Parliament at Westminster annulled the English statute, 6th of George the First, which asserted the authority of the British Parliament to extend the operation of its laws to Ireland, and also passed an Act expressly declaring that the right of the people of Ireland to be subject only to laws made by the Irish Parliament was established for ever.

It was on April 19, 1780, that Grattan brought the question of legislative independence for the first time before the House of Commons. He was unsuccessful. Henry Flood was in sympathy with the motion, but he deemed it premature, and hoped certain defeat would be avoided by

not pressing it to a division. After a debate which lasted nearly fifteen hours, ending at half-past six in the morning, Grattan discreetly withdrew the motion. Accordingly, the Commons *Journals*, which record not things said but things done, are silent in regard to the proceedings. What really mattered was Grattan's speech. By all accounts it was the finest the orator ever made, and was the one which he himself liked best. This is its conclusion :

I wish for nothing but to breathe, in this our island, in common with my fellow-subjects, the air of liberty. I have no ambition, unless it be the ambition to break your chain and contemplate your glory. I never will be satisfied so long as the meanest cottager in Ireland has a link of the British chain clanking to his rags. He may be naked ; he shall not be in iron. And I do see the time is at hand, the spirit is gone forth, the declaration is planted, and though great men should apostatize yet the cause will live ; and though the public speaker should die, yet the immortal fire shall outlast the organ which conveyed it, and the breath of liberty, like the word of the holy man, will not die with the prophet but survive him.

These stirring passages gave an immense impulse to the cause of Irish freedom. The Volunteers rallied to it in a body, under the command of the Earl of Charlemont. Raised for the defence of Ireland against a French invasion or raids by Yankee privateers, they did not cease to be citizens in becoming soldiers, as they themselves expressed it ; and a Convention of delegates of the Ulster regiments (representing 30,000 men) held at Dungannon, on February 15, 1782, gave a lead to the rest of the country by passing a series of resolutions asserting the legislative independence of Ireland, and, what was still more significant, hailing, as Protestants, the relaxation of the penal laws against their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, which, they said, was a measure fraught with the happiest consequences for the union and prosperity of Ireland. Seven days later, on February 22, 1782, Grattan again took action, by moving in the House of Commons for an Address to the King declaratory of the independence of the Irish Parliament. He asserted that the claim of

England to legislate for Ireland rested simply on force, on 'the right of the grenadier to take the property of a naked man.' To such a claim the predominance of the Volunteers was a sufficient answer. 'I add,' said Grattan, 'this man has now gotten back his arms and begs to get back his property.' Pointing to the opponents of the Address, he scornfully asked :

What do you wait for? Do you wait for a peace till the Volunteer retires and the Minister replies by his cannon? Or do you wait for more calamities in the fortunes of England, till the Empire is a wreck and the two countries go down together? Or do you delay till Providence, beholding you on your knees, shall fall in love with your meanness, and rain on your servility a Constitution, like manna? You go to the house of God when you want heat or moisture, and you interfere with God's providence by your importunities. Are the princes of the earth more vigilant than the Almighty, that you should besiege the throne of mercy with your solicitations, and hold it unnecessary to admonish the King? Or do you wait until your country speaks to you in thunder.

But the time was not yet, and the House of Commons condemned, by a majority of 69, a declaration which, only two months later, they were to carry with unanimity and rejoicing. The House divided on an amendment rejecting the proposed Address to the King. 'Tellers for the Ayes, who went out,' says the entry in the *Journals*, 'Right Hon. Mr. Clements and Mr. Robert Jephson—137; tellers for the Noes, who stayed within, Mr. Grattan and the Right Hon. Mr. Brownlow—68.' What magic influence was it that was to bring about so quickly the complete and amazing change in the views of the same majority of the Irish House of Commons? It was the word from Westminster. The British Ministry submitted; and the subsequently compliant Irish House of Commons yielded with them. The government of a nation—united and in arms—against its consent had become impossible. So the Viceroy, Lord Carlisle, wrote to Westminster on March 27, 1782. Before this letter reached its destination the Tory Government of Lord North collapsed under the failure of its policy to

subdue the revolted American colonies, and a coalition Government of Whigs and Tories under Lord Rockingham were returned to power. The new Administration included so staunch a friend of Ireland's legislative independence as Charles James Fox, one of the Secretaries of State, and in subordinate offices, two such famous Irishmen as Edmund Burke and Richard Brinsley Sheridan. The Duke of Portland was appointed Lord Lieutenant, and Colonel FitzPatrick, Chief Secretary. They arrived in Dublin on April 14, 1782, bringing a message from the British Government, through the King, recommending the Irish Parliament to satisfy the aspirations of the country.

Just a month previously, on March 14, before the fall of the North Government, Grattan gave notice in the House of Commons that on April 16 he would, for the third time, move a declaration of Irish independence. The Volunteers held the city that day. A large force was drawn up in College Green, and they presented arms as Grattan passed through their ranks to the House of Commons. There was a full gathering of members. 'The House having met,' to quote an interesting contemporary comment in the *Parliament Register*, 'the galleries and Bar were crowded with spectators, and every heart panting with expectation, about 5 o'clock when the Speaker had taken the Chair.' After the reading of the message from the King, Grattan rose to speak. He was splendidly impressive and inspiring.

I have found Ireland on her knees [he cried, in his opening passages], I have watched over her with eternal solicitude. I have traced her progress from injuries to arms, and from arms to liberty—Spirit of Swift, spirit of Molyneux, your genius has prevailed. Ireland is now a Nation. In that new character I hail her. And bowing to her august presence, I say—*Esto perpetua!*

Grattan moved an Address from the Commons to the King, laying before His Majesty the causes of their discontents and jealousies. It was remarkably outspoken and comprehensive in its terms. The Commons told the King 'that his subjects in Ireland are a free people, and

the Crown of Ireland is an Imperial Crown, inseparably annexed to the Crown of Great Britain, on which connection the interests and happiness of both nations essentially depend, but that the Kingdom of Ireland is a distinct Kingdom with a Parliament of her own, the sole legislature thereof.' They went on to assert 'that there is no body of men competent to make laws to bind this Nation except the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland, nor any other Parliament which hath any authority or power of any sort whatsoever in this country, save only the Parliament of Ireland.' They assured His Majesty 'that in this right the very essence of our liberties exist, a right which we, on the part of all the people of Ireland, do claim as their birthright, and which we cannot yield but with our lives.' The Address was seconded by Brownlow. Not a voice was raised against it. It passed *nemine contradicente*. Even the Lords, on the following day, adopted it with equal unanimity. Then there was an adjournment for three weeks to give time for communication with England.

What would the British Government do? That they desired to gratify the Irish demand was well understood in Dublin. But there was some doubt and uncertainty as to the exact form the recognition of Ireland's right would take. There were two ways of doing it. One was the renunciation by England of what she conceived to be a right to bind Ireland by her laws, but was ready to give up under the pressure of circumstances. The other was a declaration by England that though she had exercised this right she had never, in fact, constitutionally possessed it. The point is of importance, as it led to a dispute between Grattan and Flood, and the wrecking for ever of their long and intimate friendship. Neither of these courses was adopted. It was felt that the first would give offence to Ireland, who declined to admit that England ever had such a right; and that the other would be wounding to the pride of England, to which, therefore, she would never consent.

What happened was that a Bill simply repealing the Declaratory Act of George the First was carried through the British Parliament. Fox moved in the House of Commons for leave to bring in the Bill on May 17, 1782. That his speech wanted nothing in generosity and candour is evident from even the brief reports of it which are given in the newspapers of the time. He said he had always held the opinion that 'it was downright tyranny to make laws for the internal government of a people who were not represented among those by whom such laws were made'; and that it was an added wrong in the case of Ireland that this power had been exercised by the English Parliament 'for the purpose only of oppressing and distressing her.' He yielded to the claims of Ireland, 'not because he was intimidated and afraid to oppose them, but because he believed them to be founded in justice.' 'He would rather see Ireland totally separated from the Crown of England than kept in obedience only by force.' Finally, he stated that the effect of the Bill would be to abolish the interference of the Privy Council of Ireland and the Privy Council of England in the legislation of the Irish Parliament, and to restore to the Irish House of Lords its right to hear and decide appeals as the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland. No opposition to the Bill, no desire of aiming at the same end by different methods, was expressed in the debate. This unanimity of feeling was pointed out and emphasized by Edmund Burke. Under the circumstances it was not necessary for him 'to fight the battle of Ireland,' as he put it.

Her cause was nearest his heart [said he], and nothing gave him so much satisfaction, when he was first honoured with a seat in that House, as that it might be in his power, some way or other, to be of service to the country that gave him birth; and he had always said to himself that if such an insignificant Member as he was could ever be so fortunate as to render an essential service to England and his sovereign, or Parliament were going to reward him for it, he would say to them—'Do something for Ireland, do something for my country, and I am ever rewarded.'

The last word in the debate was said by Lord Newenham,

who pictured what would happen when Fox's speech was read in Ireland. 'There would not, he was sure, be a dry eye from one end of the island to the other; every man would get drunk, and cry for joy.'

In the House of Lords, on the same day, the Bill was also discussed. There was complete agreement in opinion as to the justice of the Irish demand and in determination to concede it, among the Lords as among the Commons. Only one slight note of dissent was struck by Lord Loughborough, the famous lawyer, who was disposed to question the wisdom of setting up courts of appeal, separate and independent, in Ireland and Great Britain. 'Both countries,' he said, 'have the same common law, and uniformity of it could not be preserved without a supreme judicature common to both; and this point he thought of the utmost importance to their future connection.' Lord Shelburne, one of the Secretaries of State, assuming the airs of a superior, perhaps unwittingly, was somewhat condescendingly favourable to the Irish House of Lords. 'The Irish,' said he, 'though fully sensible of the impartial administration of justice by their lordships, were desirous to be subject to the judicature of their own peers, who had increased in wealth and consequence, and had by the improvement of their minds, acquired the knowledge which fitted them for the execution of such a trust better than in ancient times, when arms were their chief employment.' The premier Irish peer, the Duke of Leinster, who had a seat in the House as a peer of Great Britain, supported the Government. In this atmosphere of good will, the Repeal Bill was carried rapidly through the British Parliament. On June 14 it was passed unanimously in the House of Commons, and, according to the *Journals*, 'Mr. Secretary Fox was appointed to carry the Bill to the Lords and desire their concurrence.' The Lords also quickly advanced it through all its stages. It received the Royal Assent on June 21, 1782.

The Irish Parliament was then in session. Lords and Commons had re-assembled on May 27. The Duke of

Portland sent them a message announcing that both Houses of the British Parliament were agreed in a desire to gratify their wishes, and that the King was ready to give his assent to Acts giving effect to them legislatively. Grattan, in the House of Commons, at once rose to bear testimony 'to the candid and unqualified manner' in which Ireland's demand had been yielded to by the Government. 'I understand,' said he, 'that Great Britain gives up *in toto* every claim to authority over Ireland.' He met the point, which he had reason to know would be raised, that an express renunciation should be exacted from Great Britain. 'I have not the least idea,' he said, 'that in repealing the 6th of George the First, Great Britain should be bound to make any declaration that she had formerly usurped a power. No, this would be a foolish caution, a dishonourable caution. The nation that insists upon the humiliation of another is a foolish nation. Ireland is not a foolish nation.' He moved an Address to the King stating that 'the unqualified and unconditional repeal' of the Declaratory Act was 'a measure of consummate wisdom and justice, suitable to the dignity and eminence of both nations, exalting the character of both and furnishing a perpetual pledge of mutual amity.' The Address further assured His Majesty 'that no constitutional question between the two nations would any longer exist which can interrupt their harmony, and that Great Britain, as she has approved of our firmness, so she may rely on our affection.' This passage was challenged by two able lawyers in the House, Mr. Walshe and Sir Samuel Bradstreet, the Recorder of Dublin, on the ground that it precluded further action, should it be found—and they argued that it would most certainly be found—that the repeal of the Declaratory Act was inadequate to the emancipation of Ireland. Walshe asked what the Repeal Bill, introduced in the English Parliament, amounted to? 'Simply this, and not a jot more,' he answered: 'It expunges the declaration of power from the English statute book, but it does not deny the power hereafter to make

laws to bind Ireland whenever England shall think herself in sufficient force for the purpose.' He added: 'Will it be contended that this assumed power of Great Britain to legislate for us can be taken away by implication? No lawyer will say it can. Then Ireland cannot be said to be completely emancipated until England, by an Act of her own Legislature, unequivocally and expressly declares that she has no power to make laws to bind us in any instance whatever. I say, until that is done, Ireland can never have a sincere affection for or confidence in Great Britain.' These views were adopted by Flood, but he did not support them by his vote in the very remarkable division which concluded the debate. Walshe and Bradstreet, who challenged the division, were appointed tellers against the motion for the Address. They had no one to count. According to the Commons *Journals* the numbers were: for the Address, 211; against, none.

After the division, Mr. Beauchamp Bagenal, one of the Members for Co. Carlow, gave notice that he would move on the morrow the appointing of a day of thanksgiving 'for the union, harmony, and cordial affection' which had happily been brought about between Ireland and Great Britain; and, after that, that the House do resolve itself into a committee 'to take into consideration the sum we should grant for the purchasing of an estate and building a suitable mansion for our illustrious benefactor, Henry Grattan, Esq., and his heirs for ever, a testimony of our gratitude for the unequalled service that he has done this Kingdom.' Both motions were duly adopted. Bagenal moved that the grant to Grattan be £100,000. Grattan refused to take so large a sum. Ultimately he was induced to accept £50,000, as it would enable him to give up his practice at the Bar, and devote himself exclusively to the service of the country. The Government was also desirous of showing their gratitude. Early in the year the House of Commons had decided to purchase the house in the Phoenix Park, now known as the Viceregal Lodge, as a summer residence for the Lord Lieutenant. Portland

offered to give the house to Grattan. 'The merits of this offer is somewhat diminished,' says Lecky, in his *History of Ireland*, 'by the following paragraph relating to it in Portland's confidential correspondence with Shelburne—'For this I was the more anxious as, in addition to the very extravagant price the public has agreed to pay for it, I am persuaded that it will require at least £10,000 to make it fit for the reception of any Chief Governor.' The offer, however, was declined by Grattan. An estate was purchased for him in Queen's County, along the River Barrow, but he did not reside there. Towards the end of October, 1782, he married Miss Henrietta FitzGerald, and settled down in the little hamlet of Tinnahinch, between the Dargle and Powerscourt, in Co. Wicklow.

The legislative independence of Ireland seemed now to be fully established. Poynings' Law was repealed by the Irish Parliament. The Bill to revoke it was brought in by Barry Yelverton in the House of Commons on June 1, 1782. It was the last Act of the Irish Parliament to pass under the old procedure under Poynings' Law. The heads of the Bill were agreed to by Commons and Lords, and brought to the Viceroy by representatives of both Houses—Lord Charlemont, the Earl of Mornington, Barry Yelverton, George Ogle, and Dennis Daly—with the usual request that they be sent to England for the sanction of the English Privy Council. The Bill was promptly returned from London, passed once more through both Houses, and became law on July 27, 1782. Meantime, Flood had been signally defeated in an attempt to raise in the House of Commons the vexed question of explicit renunciation as against simple repeal. On July 19 he moved for leave to bring in heads of a Bill for the purpose of affirming the sole and exclusive right of the Irish Parliament to make laws for Ireland in all matters, internal and external. Grattan was furiously scornful. He declared that the House was being made the theatre of envy, ostentation, and egotism; and its time wasted in discussing

a matter which owed its origin to rancour and disappointed ambition :

It is easy now [said he, in words of cutting asperity] for men to express their zeal when the difficulty is over, and to contend for us on the ground which we have made for them. They who lament the bringing on a declaration of right may, after that declaration and after the repeal, call for a renunciation. When the breach is made the coward may enter, and is most likely to be the most licentious, but his activity is proof that the business is done and the danger is over.

Flood's motion was negatived without a division. Then Grattan, carried away by the impetuosity of his disposition, tried to improve on his victory by moving an extraordinary resolution. It was to the effect that any person who should propagate, in any way, the opinion that any right whatsoever existed in the British Parliament over the Parliament of Ireland was an enemy of both kingdoms. 'Worse than Russian Government!' exclaimed Flood. He moved the adjournment of the House, but was beaten by 99 votes to 13. Grattan having put his resolution into writing, submitted it to the House in the following modified form: 'That leave was refused to bring in the Bill, because the sole and exclusive right to legislate for Ireland, in all cases whatsoever, internal and external, has been asserted by the Parliament of Ireland, and has been fully, finally, and irrevocably acknowledged by the British Parliament.'

There was a bitter personal encounter again between the two great protagonists, at the end of the debate. 'I hope,' said Flood sarcastically, 'that the honourable gentleman in settling the Constitution will take care for the future to keep within its bounds.' That was a palpable hit, and Grattan could only meet it with the stiff retort of offended dignity reproving the insolence of an inferior. 'The right hon. gentleman may argue with me,' he said, 'may confute me, but he cannot rebuke me. I would not be rebuked.' But he carried his resolution, and had it entered in the *Journals*.

Was Grattan just in declaring that Flood, in his endeavours to belittle his splendid achievement, was animated solely by malignant and petty jealousy of a greater and more successful rival? Who can tell? It is an old and common charge in the political controversies of all countries. Who can fathom the human mind and heart? Though Flood was the older man, and hitherto the more conspicuous, he had been superseded by one who was a youth when he was leader. His mental fires were still bright and effectual, but they paled before the dazzling brilliancy of the other's genius. Yet it was his ambition to play a leading part, so that he might be remembered in history. 'The honourable gentleman is erecting a temple of liberty. I hope that, at least, I shall be allowed a niche in the fane.' So he said in 1779, wistfully and pathetically, when Barry Yelverton first brought in his Bill for the repeal of Poynings' Law. Is it not one of those unpremeditated sayings which expose, as in a flash, a hidden cherished thought and the secret springs of action? Even so, this craving for fame is, at the worst, but the weakness of a noble mind. I recall, too, the fine passage with which he concluded his appeal to the House of Commons for some more legal, fundamental, and unalterable security for Ireland's independence than was provided by the simple repeal of the Declaratory Act. He said:

Were the voice with which I now utter this the last effort of expiring nature; were the accent which conveys it to you the breath that was to waft me to that grave to which we all tend and to which my footsteps rapidly accelerate, I would go on, I would make my exit by a loud demand for your rights. And I call upon the God of truth and liberty, who has so often favoured you, and who has of late looked down upon you with such a peculiar grace and glory of protection, to continue to you His inspirings, to crown you with the spirit of His completion, and to assist you against the errors of those that are honest as well as against the machinations of those that are not.

The solemnity and earnest feeling with which this passage is suffused are irresistible. Does it not show that Flood was just as likely as Grattan to have been moved

by the purest feelings of disinterested patriotism? The difference between them was as to method rather than as to principle. Grattan's view was the more generous. England was being pressed to do a humiliating as well as a wholly unnecessary thing. It was incompatible with the dignity of a great nation. The mean distrust of it was most dishonourable to the little minds who made it. Flood was convinced he was the more logical. His position was that when the fortunes of a nation were at stake you must act on cold reason, not on hot impulse, with open-eyed foresight, not with the blindness of trust. If Grattan carried the House of Commons, Flood carried the people. There was a growing popular dissatisfaction with the inadequacy of the measures taken to safeguard the independence of Ireland; and at this juncture, by a very unlucky chance, an unexpected thing happened, which put the country in a ferment. A writ of error, to the Court of King's Bench at Westminster, from the judgment of an Irish Court, was, notwithstanding the repeal of the 6th of George the First, decided by Lord Mansfield.

What a seeming confirmation of Flood's distrust of the good faith of England! The cry arose that Ireland had been befooled by a hollow English statute. But a reassuring explanation was quickly forthcoming. In the British House of Commons, on December 19, 1782, Mr. Secretary Townshend stated that the case was entered for hearing eighteen months previously, and, therefore, long before the Repeal Act, that by some accident it had been delayed, and that the Court was bound to decide it. He added that he found there were also two Irish appeals before the British House of Lords, which had been listed before the Act of last session, but he understood they were removed and that measures were being taken to prevent any more appeals of the kind being brought to England. But that was not all. There had been a change of Government. The death of Lord Rockingham led to the resignation of Fox, and the confirmation in office of the Tory section of the administration under Lord Shelburne.

Yet the new Government magnanimously decided to satisfy Irish feeling to the full by passing an Act of Renunciation. Accordingly, on January 22, 1783, Townshend moved for leave to bring in a Bill 'for removing and preventing all doubts which have arisen, or may arise, concerning the exclusive rights of the Parliament and Courts of Ireland in matters of legislation and judicature; and for preventing any writ of error or appeal from any of His Majesty's Courts in the Kingdom of Ireland from being received, heard, or adjudged in any of His Majesty's Courts in the Kingdom of Great Britain.' The Bill passed through both Houses without opposition and received the Royal Assent on April 17, 1783. It fully and explicitly declared

the right claimed by the people of Ireland to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of that Kingdom in all cases whatever, and to have all actions and suits at law or in equity, which may be instituted in that Kingdom, decided by His Majesty's Courts therein finally and without appeal from thence, shall be, and it is hereby declared to be, established and ascertained for ever, and shall at no time be questioned or questionable.

Thus were set at rest all the doubts of Flood and his supporters. Grattan would have been more than human if he did not feel mortified by this signal success of his rival, more especially as it seriously damaged his own reputation as a Parliamentarian and his influence in the country. He had been nervous and profoundly dispirited during the agitation. He was anxious that Ireland should justify her legislative independence by turning it to the peaceful purpose of political and social development. But, instead of that, there was a danger of united Ireland being again disrupted and the existing harmony among classes and creeds coming to an end amid the harsh and jangled notes of civil hate and strife. Bitterness and antipathy arose in Grattan's heart; the bitterness at seeing his great national achievement apparently frustrated in its ends, the antipathy for the man who, through malign jealousy, as he supposed, would make his work abortive. He determined

to have his revenge, and made ready to seize the occasion whenever it might arise.

The day came on October 28, 1783. Sir Henry Cavendish moved that the poverty of the country demanded every possible retrenchment in the expenses of the Government. Flood vehemently supported the motion. Grattan as strongly opposed it. The passion of combined political antagonism and personal enmity was thus let loose. The antagonists differed in their styles of speaking, as they differed in their personal appearances, but were mentally well matched. Flood was tall, dignified, weighty and magisterial. The lithe and frail form of Grattan bent and swayed as he made his ferocious assault. He supposed a public character, whose constant practice it was 'to abuse every man who differed from him and to betray every man who trusted him.' He divided the life of the public character he had in mind into three stages. 'In the first he was intemperate, in the second corrupt, and in the third seditious.' Flood, the leader of Opposition in his early days, had accepted a sinecure office in the Government as Vice-Treasurer, and for several years was highly paid for doing nothing. 'I will suppose,' said Grattan, still pursuing his rhetorical device of oblique reference, 'this gentleman to be corrupted by a great sinecure office to muzzle his declamation, to swallow his invectives, to give his assent and vote to the Ministers, and become a supporter of the Government, its measures, its embargo, and its American War.' Other incidents in the career of Flood were recalled. 'With regard to the liberties of America, which were inseparable from ours, I will suppose this gentleman to have been an enemy, decided and unreserved; that he voted against her liberty, and voted, moreover, for an Address to send 4,000 Irish troops to cut the throats of the Americans; that he called these butchers "armed negotiators," and stood, with a metaphor in his mouth and a bribe in his pocket, a champion against the rights of America, which was the only hope of Ireland and the only refuge of the liberties of mankind.' This public

character was, among other despicable things, 'a notorious cheat and perjurer,' 'a false patriot,' 'a hypocrite,' 'a traitor,' and 'a coward.' Not content with arraiguing the public conduct of his opponent, Grattan sought also to wound him by alluding to his physical defects. Flood had a false palate, which affected his voice; his nose was short, and his complexion pallid. Then, in a flaming peroration, throwing all disguises aside, Grattan thus directly addressed Flood:

Sir, your talents are not so great as your life is infamous. You were silent for years, and you were silent for money. When affairs of consequence to the Nation were debating, you might be seen passing by those doors like a guilty spirit, just waiting for the moment of putting the question that you might hop in and give your venal vote; or at times, with a vulgar brogue, apeing the manners and affecting the infirmities of Lord Chatham; or, like a kettle-drummer, lathering yourself into popularity to catch the vulgar; or you might be seen hovering over the dome, like an ill-omened bird of night, with sepulchral notes, a cadaverous aspect, and broken beak, ready to stoop and pounce upon your prey. You can be trusted by no man; the people cannot trust you, the Ministers cannot trust you; you deal out the most impartial treachery to both. You tell the Nation it is ruined by other men, while it is sold by you. You fled from the Embargo; you fled from the Mutiny Bill; you fled from the Sugar Bill. I, therefore, tell you, in the face of your country, before all the world, and to your beard, you are not an honest man.

The crowded House was startled at first by the suddenness and fury of Grattan's attack, and then sat through it all in the silence and bated breath of awe. And what a figure of wrath the great orator must have presented! As he delivered these lightning strokes, in a voice appropriately sharp and piercing, his long, thin features attenuated still more by his fury, one thinks of a cavalry man rising in his saddle, and waving a flashing sword aloft for the final, ruthless, and irresistible stroke! Flood, dogged as well as intrepid, was shaken but not overthrown. He was exasperated by the onslaught all the more because there were incidents in his career that gave it edge, as his face, flushing red with shame, or some kindred feeling, indicated

only too well. But his spirit was not easily quelled. Rising instantly, he turned against Grattan Grattan's own weapon of personal invective. The attack had been directed to the wrong quarter. It was Grattan and not Flood who was the knave and traitor. Thus was Flood as bitter and unjust to Grattan as Grattan had been to him. In short, impassioned sentences he presented his opponent to the House as a mere oratorical windbag, who, having been bought by his country, an allusion to the gift of £50,000, had as promptly sold her. He was less rhetorical and more direct than Grattan, but not so piercing, and though equally envenomed was not so overwhelming in effect. He said :

I do not come here, dressed in a rich wardrobe of words, to delude the people. I am not the gentleman who subsists on your accounts. I am not the mendicant patriot who was bought by my country for a sum of money, and then sold my country for prompt payment. I never was bought by the people, nor ever sold them. I object to no man being in office. A patriot in office is more the patriot for being there. There was a time when the glories of the great Duke of Marlborough shrank and withered before the right hon. gentleman, when palaces superior to Blenheim were to be built for his reception, when pillars and pyramids were to be raised and adorned with emblazoned inscriptions sacred to his virtue. But the pillars and pyramids are now sunk, though then the great Earl of Chatham was held inferior to him.

Flood went on in the same tirade until Perry, the Speaker, interposed. He said he had suffered inexpressible pain during the contest, and nothing but the calls of the House to hear the two Members could have made him sit silent so long. Flood appealed for a further hearing. 'Permit me to say,' he said, 'that if the hon. gentleman often provokes such contests as this he will have little to boast of at the end of the session.' But the Speaker would not give way. In his words and voice there was the decision and the commanding tone of his office and its responsibilities. The House, having had enough of excitement for one night, supported the Chair. Flood thereupon went out of the chamber. A message was

immediately sent to Grattan. It was the fashion at the time to end up a battle of words with an exchange of pistol bullets. Happily, there was no encounter. On the way to the ground the parties were arrested, and bound over to keep the peace in recognisances of £20,000 each. No other ending could have been more satisfactory. After all, both Grattan and Flood could well have afforded to laugh at one another's sneers, and the spite that dictated them. They had over-reached themselves, rendering the attack and the reply alike nugatory by the very exaggeration and venom of their language.

Such, then, was the bloodless revolution of '82. The power of the Privy Councils of Ireland and England separately to amend or reject the proposed legislation of the Irish Parliament was abolished. The Irish Lords had restored to them the final decision of questions of law arising in Ireland. There was no longer any limitation to subjects of debate or legislation in the Irish Commons. The Irish Parliament could reject Bills introduced by the Ministry, without the fear which formerly fettered it that such Bills could be carried through the British Legislature and made to apply to Ireland. All Bills passed in the Irish Parliament had still to be sent to London for the Royal Assent; but if returned they were to be sent back unaltered, under the Great Seal of England. Meetings of the Irish Parliament were to be summoned, as in England, by Proclamation.

Other long-established causes of discontent were also removed. The ports of Ireland were opened to the trade of all foreign countries. The Mutiny Bill, for the maintenance of a standing army, instead of being passed for a long term of years, was limited from session to session. The Judges of the High Court could formerly be dismissed at pleasure. Their independence was now secured by making them removable only by an Address to the Crown from both Houses of Parliament. And shortly afterwards Parliament met every year instead of every two years.

MICHAEL MACDONAGH.

DESCARTES

BY REV. J. BYRNE O'CONNELL, PH.D.

ONE of the characteristics of the history of human thought is that nearly all great periods in Philosophy are ushered in by some new 'method.' Men, it would seem, do not intend changing the whole content of Philosophy, but rather the method or order of arranging what is already known. Indeed it may be said that the main object of some of the greatest philosophers has been to arrive at truth by a rearrangement of knowledge in the light of some general and unifying principle. Parmenides' *Principle of Identity*; Plato's *Subsisting Archetypes*; the *Organon* of Aristotle, with the *Novum Organum* of Bacon; Descartes' *Methodical Doubt*; Spinoza's *Substance*; Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*; and Bergson's *L'Évolution Créatrice*—all are examples of new methods in Philosophy, and of attempts at re-arranging the content of knowledge under unifying principles.

Now, friend and foe alike bear testimony that Descartes created a revolution in thought by his 'method'—that he is, in fact, the father of Modern Philosophy. Kant, we are aware, has often been the recipient of this somewhat doubtful compliment, but we can see the subjective tendencies of Königsberg already well developed in Cartesianism, so that Descartes, not Kant, is the father of our modern systems. The understanding, therefore, of the man and his doctrines is of no small importance to the student of philosophy, and it will be the object of the present article to show how Descartes may justly be called the reformer in the domain of philosophic thought.

René Descartes was born at La Haye, in Touraine,

in 1596. Being of a wealthy demi-noblesse family, he was sent, at the age of eight, to be educated by the Jesuits at La Flèche. His studies there embraced mathematics, physics, astronomy, philosophy, and theology, in addition to languages and history; but of these his predilection was for mathematics—a point which is really the key to the mentality of Descartes. He applied himself with diligence to all his studies; and though he himself speaks of the ‘mediocrity of his understanding,’ it is, nevertheless, on record that he was remarkable already at La Flèche for his passionate love of knowledge, his ability, versatility, and even for a habit of doubting the authority of tradition and of his teachers. Yet when he left college in 1612, it was with the feeling that his real education had not yet begun, that he had yet ‘to seek that knowledge which he could find only within himself or in the great book of the world.’

I had been nourished in letters from my infancy. . . . I had a great desire to become acquainted with them. I was in one of the most celebrated schools in Europe, where I thought learned men would be found, if such existed anywhere; I learned there all that the others learned, and even being dissatisfied with what we were taught, I went through all the books I could get hold of . . . : moreover, I knew that the others did not hold me inferior to my fellow-students, although there were already some among them destined to take the place of our masters. . . . But as soon as I had finished all the course of study, at the termination of which a man is usually received into the ranks of the learned, I entirely altered my opinion, for I found myself hampered by so many doubts and errors that it seemed I reaped no benefit from my effort to instruct myself, except that I discovered more and more my own ignorance.¹

After a short stay at Rennes, where his father had just settled (after his second marriage in 1612), Descartes set out for Paris, where, attracted by the pleasures of the gay capital, he led for a short time the life of an emancipated undergraduate. But the intellectual and religious foundations laid at La Flèche were too deep and solid to be shaken by the life of the *jeunesse dorée* of Paris, and

¹ *Discourse on Method*, Part i.

consequently we find Descartes very shortly afterwards renewing the acquaintance of Father Mersenne, and meeting, for the first time, Claude Mydorge, one of the celebrated mathematicians of the day. In these he found companions more suitable to his temperament than those of the gilded youth of Paris, and he accordingly abandoned himself to their tuition for the next two years. What was the exact state of his mind at the end of this period may be gathered from his own words, written many years afterwards. 'Above all,' he says,¹ 'I took pleasure in mathematics, because of the certainty and evidence of their reasons; but I did not yet remark their true use: and thinking that they served the mechanical arts alone, I was surprised that since their foundations were so firm and solid, nothing more lofty had been built upon them.' Hence, dissatisfied with the speculative inadequacy of the other sciences, especially philosophy, and with the practical insufficiency of mathematics, he resolved

to seek only that knowledge which could be found within himself or rather in the great book of the world, and to employ the remainder of his youth in gathering various experiences, in testing himself under such conditions as fortune offered him, and above all in reflecting upon the things which came before him in such wise that he might draw some profit from them.²

Paris at this time was a centre of political turmoil, and afforded little opportunity for the honourable career of a soldier. Hence, quitting Paris, in May, 1617, Descartes enlisted as a volunteer in the army of Prince Maurice of Orange, then at Breda. Here he remained for two years, during which he saw no active service, and thus was free to cultivate his studies.

The plan, therefore, of joining the army in order to study life in its varying aspects had so far not succeeded; and it was consequently with some little anxiety of mind that he left the service of Prince Maurice in 1619, and, setting out for Upper Germany, joined the Bavarian troops. The winter of 1619 was spent at Neuberg, on the Danube,

¹ Op. cit. Part i.

² Ibid.

and it was here that there occurred the intellectual crisis of his life.

I was then [he tells us] in Germany, whither I had been called by the wars in progress there, and as I was returning to the army after the coronation of the Emperor, the beginning of winter detained me in a quarter where, finding no intercourse to attract me, and having fortunately no cares or passions to trouble me, I remained all day shut up alone in a sitting-room, where I had perfect leisure to commune with my thoughts.¹

During this communing with his thoughts, there flashed across his mind that all geometrical problems might be solved by algebraical symbols; that the mysteries of nature and the laws of mathematics might both be unlocked by the same key, and that a system of methodic doubt might ultimately lead to certainty in philosophy. Though he did not actually apply this method to work out his system till many years later, he formulated there and then, at Neuberg, the four fundamental principles of that method. 'The first was never to accept anything as true when I did not recognise it to be clearly so, i.e., to avoid carefully all precipitation and prejudice and to include in my opinions nothing beyond that which should present itself so clearly and distinctly to my mind, that I might have no reason to doubt it.' This is the main principle, the *pièce de résistance*, of Cartesianism, for it lays down as the criterion of truth the clear and distinct perception of an object.

The second was to divide each of the difficulties which I should examine into as many portions as were possible, and as should be required for its better solution. . . . The third was to conduct my thoughts in order, by beginning with the simplest objects and those most easy to know, so as to mount little by little, as if by steps, to the most complex knowledge, and even assuming an order among those which do not naturally precede one another. . . . And the last was to make everywhere enumerations so complete, and surveys so wide, that I should be sure of omitting nothing.²

Seeing, however, no immediate prospect of being able to build up his philosophy according to this method, Descartes, somewhat in the spirit of a pragmatist, laid

¹ Op. cit. Part ii.

² Ibid.

down four maxims whereby he could direct his conduct until the time arrived when he could set forth his system.

But in order [he says] that I might not remain undecided in my actions, while reason obliged me to be so in my opinions, and that I might not henceforth cease to live as happily as possible, I provisionally made myself a moral, consisting of three or four maxims. The first was to obey the laws and customs of my country, keeping always to the religion in which, by the grace of God, I had been instructed from my childhood; and in everything else governing myself according to the most moderate and practical opinions. The second was to be as firm and as resolute in my actions as possible, and to follow the most doubtful opinions, when I had once determined on them, no less constantly than if they were certain. The third was always to endeavour to conquer myself rather than fortune, to change my desires rather than the order of the world, and generally to accustom myself to believe that nothing is so entirely within our power as our own thoughts. Finally, I bethought me to review the various occupations of men in this life, in order to make choice of the best, and though I desired to say nothing about those of others, I believed I could not do better than continue in my own—i.e., in employing all my life in cultivating my reason, and advancing as far as I could in the knowledge of truth according to the method I had laid down for myself.¹

Here let us note in passing the essentially mathematical nature of Descartes' mind. At La Flèche his favourite subject was mathematics. Later on, as we have seen, the same study possessed such an attraction for him that he devoted an entire two years to its pursuit. Even during the course of his army career we find him absorbed in the same interest. It is little wonder, therefore, that we find him applying the methodic doubt of the geometer to the study of philosophy, and evolving thereby *modo mathematico* a system of his own.

Descartes, therefore, before quitting Neuberg, had firmly resolved to reconstruct the whole edifice of philosophy; and to this end he solemnly promised Our Lady of Loretto a pilgrimage in her honour should she prosper his design. In 1620 we find him present at the battle of Weisier Berg, wintering with the army in Bohemia; and the following

¹ Op. cit. Part iii.

year serving in Hungary. But the wild scenes of war had never held much attraction for the studious mind of Descartes, and now that he had resolved on a way of solving his doubts, he took the first favourable opportunity of leaving the army. Accordingly, in 1621, he set out on a series of private tours through Germany, Poland, Switzerland, Italy, and France, paying two short visits home in the interval. During his journeying in Italy, in 1622, he paid his vows at Loretto, and was in Rome on the eve of the Jubilee.

In 1625 he determined to settle down once more in his old retreat in Paris, and, in company with his friends Mersenne and Mydorge, he devoted himself to the practical work of grinding the best glasses for use in optical instruments. But this work did not fill his thoughts to the exclusion of all other interests, for we still find him speculating as to the nature of the soul, of man, and of God. His growing reputation, however, as a mathematician and philosopher, made all attempts at concealing himself impossible, and he had, therefore, no leisure to carry out the Neuberg intention to rebuild the edifice of philosophy. Wearied at length by the importunities of friends, and despairing of being able to obtain any peaceful solitude in Paris, he betook himself to the siege of Rochelle (1628), and entered the city with the troops.

After this event Descartes came into contact with Cardinal de Berulle, who strongly advised him to devote his energies to philosophy. He, therefore, at length determined to secure elsewhere the solitude denied to him by his Parisian friends, and having appointed Father Mersenne and the Abbé Picot the executors of his business, he suddenly disappeared from the capital, carrying with him very few books, but the *Summa* and the Bible were among them. Holland was his objective, but whether he went there at once or retired for some time to the North of France is not known for certain. At any rate he took up his abode permanently in Amsterdam, in 1629, and was out of it only on five occasions—in 1630, when he probably paid a flying

visit to England ; in 1634, when he made an excursion to Denmark ; and in 1644, 1647, and 1648, when he visited France. He shunned society as much as possible, not because he despised it in the spirit of a misanthrope, but because he subordinated everything to his work. 'Although,' he says in a letter to Chanut, 'I shun the multitude because of all the impertinences one meets with, I always hold that the greatest pleasure in life is the enjoyment of conversation with those whom we esteem.'

The first product of Descartes' seclusion and literary activity was a treatise on *Light*, or *The World*, which was ready for publication in 1633, but did not actually come into the hands of the public until after its author's death. The reason for this was that the treatise was based on the Copernican theory of the earth's movement. Now Galileo, who influenced the mind of Descartes on more points than one, had been condemned in 1616, and was confined in prison by the Holy Office in 1633, the very year in which *The World* was ready for publication. On learning the fate of Galileo, Descartes was naturally loath to publish his own work, for 'though he believed the reasons it contained were founded on very certain and very evident demonstrations, yet he would not for anything maintain them against the authority of the Church.' In a similar strain he writes later to Mersenne that, though he is certain of the validity of his reasoning, yet he is equally certain of the Pope's infallibility, and that in time, he felt, that one truth would not be found contrary to the other. In this obedient submission, we get a glimpse of Descartes' attitude towards the Church,¹ which is indeed refreshing in an age when men chafe so much under its yoke. We have already seen him at Neuberg placing the whole of his future work under the protection of Our Lady of Loretto, a fact which at once shows the sincerity and humility of the philosopher. Now he submits, as an obedient son of the Church, to her decrees, although he was personally convinced of the truth of the Copernican theory, and

¹ See Note on p. 182.

although he himself had not been struck at. Later on he will tell us

I reviewed our theology, and claimed as much as any to attain to heaven, but having learned as a very sure thing that the way to it is as open to the most ignorant as to the most learned, and that the revealed truths which lead thither are beyond our intelligence, I did not dare to submit them to my feeble reasonings, and I thought that to undertake to examine them, and to succeed therein, I should want some extraordinary assistance from above, and need to be more than man.¹

During the following years Descartes turned his attention to the building of his own system of philosophy. In 1637 there appeared the famous *Discourse on Method*, a work which is at the same time a unique piece of autobiography and a clear exposition of the method whereby he hoped to revolutionise philosophy. To the *Method* he added three small works on *Dioptrics*, *Meteors*, and *Geometry*, which were to serve as illustrations of its application. Four years later he published his *Metaphysical Meditations*, whose chief aim was 'to demonstrate by reasons of philosophy rather than of theology the two questions of God and the Soul.' In 1644 there appeared at Amsterdam the third great work of Descartes, the *Principia Philosophiae*, dedicated to his friend and pupil, Princess Elizabeth of Bohemia. Besides these he published various smaller works on different aspects of science, but this trilogy, with the *Passions of the Soul*, constitute his contribution to the history of philosophy, and as such will claim our attention below.

In 1645 Chanut, the friend of Descartes, was appointed ambassador to Queen Christina of Sweden, who took some interest in literary and philosophical culture. He brought to her notice the name and growing fame of his friend, and after some correspondence on philosophy, covering a period of a few years, Descartes, in 1649, accepted an invitation to the Swedish Court. Chanut fell ill, and Descartes, who nursed him through his sickness, was compelled to issue from the sick room of his friend every morning at

¹ Op. cit. Part ii.

five to lecture on philosophy to the young Queen. Such a mode of life was ill-suited to one who from his earliest years was of a delicate constitution, and the result was that Descartes contracted inflammation of the lungs, and died on February 11, 1650.

Let this brief historical sketch suffice to show us Descartes as he lived and died, and let us now turn and contemplate his work as one of the great philosophers of history.

As we have already seen, the whole intention of Descartes was to build philosophy on a bed-rock of certainty, and the whole of his endeavour was to find such a foundation. He, therefore, in accordance with the first rule of his method, rejects for the moment any opinion or statement about which there could be the least suspicion of doubt.

Thus, because our senses sometimes deceive us, I wanted to suppose that nothing is such as they make us imagine it ; and because some men err in reasoning, even touching the simplest matters of geometry, I rejected as false all the reasons I had formerly treated as demonstrations ; and, finally, considering that the thoughts which we have when awake can also come to us when we are asleep, without any of them then being true, I resolved to feign that everything which entered into my mind was no more true than the illusions of my dreams.¹

In such wise does Descartes reject the testimony of the senses, and the validity of intellectual reasoning. He, therefore, rejects for the moment the existence of external reality, and even of his own body, in order to get at one solid fact, which would depend neither on sense-knowledge, nor reason, nor authority. That one fact for Descartes was the absolute and convincing testimony of his own personal existence.

But immediately afterwards I observed that while I thus desired everything to be false, I, who thought, must of necessity be something ; and remarking this truth, 'I think, therefore I am,' was so firm and so assured that all the most extravagant suppositions

¹ Op. cit. Part iv.

of the sceptics were unable to shake it, I judged I could unhesitatingly accept it as the first principle of the philosophy I was seeking.¹

Having thus discovered this great first principle on which to build his philosophy, he asks himself what is there in it that forces its acceptance on the mind? In other words, in what consists the certainty of personal self-existence, or in what may be placed the intrinsic criterion of truth?

After that I considered generally what is requisite to make a proposition true and certain . . . and having remarked that there is nothing in this 'I think, therefore I am,' which assures me that I speak the truth, except that I see very clearly that in order to think, it is necessary to exist, I judged that I might take it as a general rule that the things which we conceive very clearly and distinctly are true.²

Clearness, therefore, and distinctness was to be the Cartesian criterion of certainty.

But before applying this test to the other objects of knowledge, Descartes finds one more doubt to be dispelled—a doubt already formulated by the Pyrrhonists, and probably again current owing to the influence of such sceptics as Montaigne. For what proof have we that our very natures are not self-deceptive, so that even when we perceive things clearly and distinctly, we are not, nevertheless, deceived? Could not God, the author of our beings, have created us with natures that would constantly deceive us? Descartes solves this difficulty by appealing to the existence of a God who neither deceives nor can be deceived, and he, therefore, immediately proceeds to demonstrate both His existence and His veracity. The former he proves from the existence in the mind of the idea of a Being more perfect than himself, for

to derive such from nothing was manifestly impossible; and since it is no less repugnant to me that the more perfect should follow and depend on the less perfect, than that out of nothing should proceed something, I could not derive it from myself, so that it

¹ Op. cit. Part iv.

² Ibid.

remained that it had been put in me by a nature truly more perfect than I, which had in itself all perfections of which I could have any idea ; that is, to explain myself in one word, God.¹

And he proves the veracity of God from His Omniperfection, because, obviously, it would imply an imperfection in the nature of God could He be said to be capable of deceiving us. Having thus firmly established his criterion of certainty, 'I have,' he says, 'discovered a road which will lead us to the knowledge of other things in the universe.'

Let us, therefore, follow him further, and see how he derives a certain knowledge of the other things from his one fundamental principle. In his psychology he rejects, as before, anything about which there could be the shadow of a doubt, and he therefore eliminates all opinions springing from tradition, all testimony of the senses, and all such objects of knowledge as extension and number.

I assume, therefore [he says], that everything that I see is false ; I persuade myself that of all the things which my memory, stored with dreams, represents to me, none has ever existed ; I suppose that I have no sense ; I believe that body, shape, extension, motion, and place are only fictions of the mind.

Well does he go on to ask himself,

What, then, shall be esteemed true ? Perhaps, after all, nothing in the world is certain ? . . . Far from it ; for though I persuaded myself there was nothing in the world, no sky, no earth, no spirits, no bodies, . . . yet I could not persuade myself that I did not exist ; nor can any deceiver, however powerful or cunning, make me to be nothing, as long as I shall think I am something.²

But what is the nature of this self or *Ego*, whose existence is unquestionable ?

But yet though I know that I am, I do not yet know quite clearly *what* I am. What have I believed myself to be hitherto ? Without doubt, I thought I was a man ; but what is a man ? Shall I say that it is a rational animal ? No, indeed, for I should afterwards have to find out what an animal is and what rational is, and thus from one single question I should be launched, without knowing it, into an infinity of others more difficult and complex. . . . I considered myself as having a face, hands, arms, and all the

¹ Op. cit. Part iv.

² *Metaphysical Meditations*, Med. 2.

mechanism of flesh and bones, which I designated a body. . . .⁵ But what am I now, should I assume that there is a certain genius, who is extremely powerful, malicious, and crafty, who uses all his power to deceive us? Can I be sure that I have the least of all these things that I have just said belonged to the nature of the body? I revolve all these things in my mind, and I find none of them which I can say are in me. . . . Moreover, I reflected that I nourished myself, that I walked, felt, and thought, and I connected all these actions with the soul. Can I say that any of those attributes are in me? Feeding, walking, and sensibility depend on the body, but if it be true that I have no body, it is also true that I neither walk, nor feed, nor feel. The other attribute of the soul is thought, and here I find an attribute which alone cannot be separated from me. I am, I exist—that is certain, but for how long? As long as I think; for perhaps if I entirely ceased to think I should at the same time entirely cease to be. Therefore, strictly speaking, I am only a thing that thinks, i.e., a mind, an understanding, or a reason. I am, therefore, a thing which doubts, understands, conceives, affirms, denies, wills, wills not, which also imagines and feels.¹

Briefly, then, the result of the methodic doubt as applied to the soul is as follows. Man is not a 'rational animal,' because we have no clear idea of what that term implies. Man is not a being endowed with the mechanism of the body, because such a thought may be the work of an evil genius. Nor do those attributes which we apply to the soul, such as the power of nutrition, walking, and feeling, pertain to man's essential nature, because they are dependent on the body, whose existence is doubtful. Thought rather, and it alone, constitutes the essence of man, for that alone is inseparable from him. In such terms is the object of Cartesian psychology clearly defined—it is no longer the composite organism of body and soul, with the triple function of vegetation, sensation, and intellection, but the soul and its thought, which comprises intellection and volition, with the operations of the internal and external senses.

But the question here very naturally arises: What is the precise relation between the soul and its thought? Is

¹ Op. cit. Med. 2.

the one a mere modification of the other, or are they both only two different aspects of the same reality? The soul, replies Descartes, is in itself a substance, i.e., something which needs the Divine Concursus alone for its existence. But though it is thus autonomous or self-existent, it manifests itself to us by means of its inseparable attribute or quality, thought, which is only logically distinct from the substance in which it inheres. Thought is thus not only the principal attribute of the soul pre-supposed by all others, but it is also actually identical with it. Hence, there is no need of such distinct faculties as the intellect, the will, the memory, the imagination, etc., for the soul, with its attribute, thought, suffices to explain all the phenomena of conscious life.

The transition from the subjective analysis of thought to the discussion of its objective content is always both natural and logical, and consequently Descartes, in the 'Third Meditation,' passes to the consideration of the objective value of his thoughts. In other words, he deals with the 'critical' or criteriological problem. He first enumerates the various ideas possessed by the mind:

Among my thoughts some are like the images of things . . . as when I represent to myself a man or a chimæra, or God Himself. Others, again, have also some other forms, for when I will, when I fear, when I affirm or deny, I indeed conceive something as the subject of the action of my mind, but by this action I also add something else to the idea which I have of that thing, and of this kind of thoughts some are called wills, or affections, and others judgments.¹

Having shown that there can be no question of falsity, either in ideas, or in the affections, or in the will, he concludes that our judgment of reality alone can be false. But even here he is careful to distinguish a three-fold division of those ideas which are the subjects of such judgments: 'Now, among those ideas, some appear to be born with me, others to be foreign and come from without, and others to be made and invented by myself.' Having thus

¹ Op. cit. Med. 3.

classified his ideas, according as they are innate, foreign, or fictitious, he examines the reasons which lead him to believe that there is an objective reality corresponding to the foreign ideas. 'The first of these reasons is, that it seems to me that it is taught me by nature; and the second is, that I experience in myself that these ideas do not depend on my will, for they often represent themselves to me in spite of myself, just as at this moment, whether I will it or will it not, I feel heat.' Both reasons are rejected as invalid—for the first implies a mere 'natural inclination which leads me to believe it, and not a natural light, which makes me know it is true; and the second may be caused by some faculty within me fitted to produce these ideas without the aid of any exterior things.' Hence

all this makes me well aware that up to the present it has not been by a certain and deliberate judgment, but only by a blind and hasty impulse, that I have believed that there were things outside me. But there is another way of solving the problem, for though ideas, taken only as certain modes of thought, do not differ from one another, yet considered as images, of which one represents one thing and another represents another thing, it is evident that they are very different from one another . . . because natural light makes it manifest that there ought to be at least as much reality in the efficient and total cause as in its effect.

The Cartesian method, therefore, of determining the objective value of our ideas is to see, in the light of the Principle of Causation, if they demand an external cause or can be explained without such. Let us see, then, how Descartes applies his principles.

Now, among all these ideas which are in me besides the one which represents me to myself, in which there can be no difficulty, there is another which represents to me a God; others corporeal and inanimate things; others, angels; others, animals; and lastly, those which represent to me other men like myself. But as regards the ideas which represent other men or animals, or angels, I easily conceive that they may be formed by a mingling and composition of other ideas which I have of corporeal things and of God. And as regards the ideas of corporeal things, I recognise in them nothing so great or so excellent that it seems it could not emanate from myself. . . . There remains, therefore, the single idea of God,

which I am persuaded could not derive its origin from me alone. Now, that there is an infinite, eternal, and immutable substance in reality, corresponding to the idea of God in my mind, is proved from the fact that I could not exist without Him. For from whom should I derive my existence? From myself? No; for were I independent of every other, and if I myself were the author of my being, I should not doubt anything, I should conceive no desires, and, in short, no perfection would be wanting in me. But it may be that I am produced by my parents? This solution merely places the difficulty a step backwards. Or, perhaps, some causes less perfect than God have made me? Far from it, for it is very evident that there ought to be at least as much reality in the cause as in its effect. . . . It must, therefore, necessarily be concluded that from the mere fact that I exist, and the idea of a sovereignly perfect being is in me, the existence of God is very evidently demonstrated.

It only remains for me now to examine in what way I have acquired this idea. For I have not received it through the senses; nor is it a pure fiction or product of the mind, and consequently there is nothing more for me to say except that this idea was born and produced in me at the time I was created at the same time as the idea of myself. . . . This same God is subject to no defects and has nothing which evidences any imperfection. Whence it is sufficiently plain that He cannot be a deceiver, since natural light teaches us that deceit necessarily depends on some defect.

Descartes' solution, therefore, of the 'critical' problem is that we possess two innate ideas—that of the self and of God—which are at once both clear and distinct, and since the idea of God can come from Him alone who is incapable of deceiving us, it follows that all our clear and distinct ideas are the faithful expression of reality.

Having thus made certain of the objective value of his ideas, Descartes turns his attention to the nature of the body. What is the body? What is its relation to the soul? For, although in his psychology he has explained all the phenomena of conscious life that could be reduced to thought, he has still to account for those numerous manifestations of life that cannot be identified with it. Such are, for instance, the act of respiration, the process of digestion, and the beating of the heart. To understand

the nature of his reply, we must recall his physical theory as set out in *The World*, and afterwards developed in the *Principia*. Briefly, he rejects all conception of force from the universe, and reduces all its phenomena to mere local motion. God alone has created that movement, and man can only change its direction, without increasing or diminishing its quantity. Now, this theory of mechanics swallows up not only chemistry, but also physiology, and can, therefore, explain that part of psychology which the Aristotelians had attributed to the vegetative and sensitive souls. In other words, the activities of plant and animal life are explained in terms of physics. But how does Descartes arrive at such a mechanical conception of vital processes? The moment, he says, an act ceases to be conscious, it no longer pertains to the rational soul, but to the body. But the body of man as well as that of the brute is, like every physical body, a mere extended substance capable of movement, and consequently all man's activities which cannot be reduced to thought are mere modes of motion. Extension is the essential attribute of the body as thought is that of the soul. The body is, therefore, a mere machine, 'whose vital functions follow naturally from the mere disposition of the organs, just as the movements of a watch or other automaton.' Using Harvey's recent discovery of the blood-circulation, he says that 'it can be proved experimentally that the movement of the blood results as necessarily from the heat and parts of the heart, and from the nature of the blood itself as the movement of a clock results from the force, position, and shape of its weights and wheels.' The heart's heat is thus the cause of its contraction and beat. But in this process there are given off rarified particles of blood, some of which go to the organs of generation and others to the brain. Here they give rise to 'animal spirits,' a subtle fluid or flame, which are conducted by means of the tubular nerves to act on the muscles in the same way as the water of a spring is conveyed by means of pipes to act on the mechanical appliances of an artificial fountain.

No words, indeed, could be more explicit than the following :—

I desire you to consider [he says] that all the functions which I have attributed to this machine—such as the digestion of the food, the beating of the heart and arteries, the nourishment and growth of the members, the process of respiration, the reception in the external organs of light, sound, smell, taste, heat, and other such qualities, the impression of these ideas in the *sensus communis* and the imagination, together with their retention in the memory, the interior movements of the appetites and passions, as well as the exterior movements of the members—I desire you to reflect that all these functions follow most naturally from the mere disposition of the organs in the very same way as the movements of a watch depend upon the counterpoise and wheels. There is, therefore, no need to conceive in it any vegetative, or sensitive soul, or any other principle of life save the blood and its spirits, moved by the heat of the fire which burns continually in the heart, and which is of the very same nature as any of those other fires which exist in inanimate bodies.¹

In this way, then, does Descartes reduce biology and physiology to mechanics, and the functions of life to a mere play of mechanical forces.

Now, since thought and extension naturally exclude each other, such a conception of body and soul could only result in their absolute opposition. It is, therefore, little wonder that we find Descartes at a loss to bridge the gulf that he has created between them. Yet withal he feels certain that they are united in some way,

for truly [he says] I could never be separated from my own body as from other bodies: in it and through it I felt all my appetites and all my affections, and, finally, I was inspired with sensations of pleasure and of pain in its parts, and not in the parts of any other bodies which are distinct from it . . . Nature also teaches me by these feelings of pain, hunger, etc., that I am not only lodged in my body like a pilot in his boat, but also that I am so blended and intermingled therewith, and so very directly conjoined to it that I am but one with it.²

But what is the nature of this union? Is there a mutual interaction on the part of both? Whence arises

¹ *De Homine*.

² *Metaphysical Meditations*, Med. 6.

the feeling that the one acts on the other ? For response, Descartes has recourse to innate ideas. In a long letter to his royal pupil, Princess Elizabeth, he explains that all our knowledge ultimately depends on certain primary notions given us by nature. Some of these are concerned with such general notions as Being, Number, or Duration ; but others are more particular as, for instance, that of thought for the soul alone, that of extension for the body alone, and that of a union for both together. But although this idea is true, and though the actual union between mind and matter is real, yet it is neither true nor in conformity with reality to conceive an interaction of forces between them. This reply does not obviously satisfy the mind, and the Princess, in another letter, asks for some further explanation. Descartes was obviously baffled by the question, for he replies : ‘ It seems to me that the mind cannot distinctly conceive at one and the same time the distinction and the union of body and soul, because such would involve conceiving them at once both as one and as two things.’ But seeing how weak was this evasion of the difficulty, he hastens to assure Her Highness of his agreement with her opinion, ‘ that it is easier to attribute matter and extension to the soul than the capacity of moving and being moved by a body without having matter. But the matter attributed to thought is not thought itself and the extension of matter is not of the same nature as the extension of thought, because the former, unlike the latter, is determined as to place and excludes from it any other extended body.’ The confusion of Descartes on this point is indeed complete, for, if the words just quoted mean anything, they imply an abandonment of his original position as to the incompatibility of thought and extension. All that stands out as clear is that soul and body are diametrically opposed, and that though the soul is blended and intermingled with the body, yet in an especial way it resides in the pineal gland of the brain, whence by means of the ‘ animal spirits ’ it is kept in constant communication with the other parts of the body.

Such was Descartes, and such is his philosophy. It would take us far beyond the bounds of this article to discuss either the intrinsic merits of his doctrine, its historical development, or its influence on the thought of Europe. Our object was rather to show in what sense he may be said to have revolutionised philosophy, and, therefore, a brief retrospect will not be out of place. What, then, is peculiar in the thought of Descartes? His *statement* of a system of methodic doubt? We think not; for the two-fold process of analysis and synthesis is that of Aristotle and the schoolmen. In fact, the first thought that arises in a scholastic mind is that there is really nothing new or wonderful in the methodic doubt. Take his criterion of certainty—clearness and distinctness in perception,—surely all this is already contained in the doctrine of common sense, that evidence is the guide, and only guide, to knowledge. In criteriology he undoubtedly rejects the immediate perception of the external world, but—not to mention Greek philosophers—did not his contemporary, Hobbes, implicitly at least, hold that our mental states are the direct object of intuition? In psychology he insists so much on the extension of the body and the spirituality of the soul, that any physical reaction between them is logically rendered impossible. So completely, indeed, did he divorce them that the main problem for Geulincx, Malebranche, and Leibnitz was to explain how their parallel interaction might be rendered intelligible. And though his mechanistic conception of the universe in general, and of the vital functions in particular, formed a fashionable *divertissement* for the salons of Mme. de Sévigné and the Duchesse de Maime, yet, in scientific circles, it was accepted only as a theory of physics, and was thus relegated to its proper sphere. True, he broke away from the philosophical tradition of the ancients, but in this he was preceded by Bruno and Bacon. Descartes, in truth, was an innovator, not so much in his doctrines as in the manner by which he deduced them. He was, as we have seen, a profound mathematician, and it was because he applied the method

of mathematics to philosophy that he created the revolution in modern thought. The whole of his doctrines are one series of geometric deductions from the facts of his own consciousness. In this consists the essential vice of his method. The extension of the body and the spirituality of the soul; the immediate intuition of thought and the mediate perception of matter; the intrinsic criterion of certainty and the extrinsic foundation of truth; the mechanistic explanation of the physical world and of physiological facts—all are derived *modo mathematico* from the one self-evident axiom, *Cogito, ergo sum*.

And this method, like the doctrines, was not without its influence on subsequent philosophy. Thus, Spinoza, from a literal interpretation of the Cartesian definition of substance evolved a geometry of pantheism. Leibnitz, later, in a similar manner, establishes his system of monads, by deductions from the notion of substance conceived as an activity or energy; while later still Kant, by means of mental forms, endeavours to obtain mathematical certainty for philosophical propositions. Descartes, therefore, is an innovator, not only in his doctrines but in his method of deducing them. A bridgeless chasm between mind and matter; a radical antagonism between soul and body; a mere play of mechanical forces as an explanation of vital processes; and the application of a mathematical method to problems of philosophy—such constitutes Descartes' title to the paternity of modern thought, and such is his hapless legacy to posterity.

J. BYRNE O'CONNELL.

NOTE.—The submission of Descartes to the Church in 1633 has been interpreted in divers ways. His early biographers proclaim his sincerity in doing so, while Protestant writers naturally see an element of cowardice in his action. More recent writers—such as Gilson and Maritain—are of the opinion that his devotion to the Church was mainly prompted by a desire to further his own system. L'Abbé Maritain especially, although he admits his good faith, shows what he describes as the anti-theological bias of Descartes' purpose and writings. But it should be noted that this bias was not so much against Theology as against its scholastic setting at a time when Scholasticism itself had fallen into disrepute.

NOTES ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

By JOHN HOWLEY, M.A.

II

MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE PROPER

PRIOR to the development and popularisation of the Ignatian method of meditation, the mental prayer practised throughout the Catholic Church was of a type more fluid, more flexible, less systematic. Based on the liturgy, drawing its dogmatic sustenance from the offices and public prayers of the Church, and varying with them according to the seasons of the ecclesiastical year, the mental prayer of the pre-Reformation monk, friar, and nun had a note of freedom which we do not find in the systematic meditation. 'It is a complete anachronism,' says Dom M. Festugière, 'to speak of *meditation* in the *modern sense* of the word—three points, systematic series of acts—in connexion with Christians and monks of the first fourteen centuries. At that time they prayed, they did not *meditate*.'¹ Further on² he develops this idea.

The liturgy, so vocal and so loquacious, far from giving souls a relish for *meditation*, in itself discursive and wordy, leads them very rapidly and inevitably to *affective prayer* and to 'acquired' *contemplation*. Let us not be misunderstood in this matter. Always at the beginning of, and very often during the course of, the spiritual life, we need a text when we pray, to set our prayer going: some few pages at choice in a book related or not to the liturgy, a psalm, a passage of Scripture, a single verse, will serve. (It must be admitted

¹ 'La liturgie catholique' (in the *Revue de Philosophie*, Mai, Juin, Juillet, 1913, p. 728, note 3).

² Art. cit. p. 766.

that many souls, more than is usually thought, having progressed in spirituality, base their prayer on the Name of God only, or on the feeling of His Presence, or on the impression as a whole left by the recitation of the Divine Office, etc.) Let us remember that St. Teresa, at the beginning of her religious life, when she was only in the period of 'the purification of the senses,' only made use of a prayer-book to become recollected, and during her prayer hardly ever made a discursive use of her understanding. We will avoid the error of likening acquired contemplation to mystical prayer, but between the two states there are analogies. Now, the liturgy, thanks to the happy union it establishes between the intellectual and affective elements in spiritual life, promptly guides souls towards those modes of activity which we may name indifferently *loving contemplation* or *contemplative love, thought which loves or love which thinks*.¹

The decline in liturgy saw the rise of the meditation. The go-as-you-please orison of the old monks and friars gave place to the military precision of the *Spiritual Exercises*, yet the more simple methods were not quite forgotten. Following the example of the *Exercises*, attempts were made to systematise them, to bring them under rule. As it was found by experience that in these lower types of unitive prayer there was considerable scope for conative activity, that human effort played a large and conscious part, some of the seventeenth-century theologians who treated of mystical prayer divided contemplation into two species, the acquired and the infused. Philip of the Holy Trinity, provincial of the Carmelites of Aquitaine, made this distinction classic, in his *Summa Theologiae Mysticae*, which appeared in 1656. He was followed by Thomas de Vallgornera in 1662, and it is only in our own time that this distinction has been seriously challenged. It contributed more than anything else to the development of Quietist doctrines, for Molinos and his followers pushed the methods recognised as legitimate in the so-called acquired contemplation, to extremes.² It is not to be

¹ See also the brief history of mental prayer given in Poulain, *Les Graces d'Oraison*, chap. ii. sect. 5 (C.T.S. booklet, *The Prayer of Simplicity*, p. 89 et seq.).

² Cf. Poulain, *Les Graces d'Oraison*, 5th ed. chap. iv. par. 9.

found in the earlier mystics, as Saudreau and others have shown, unless violence is done to the texts. Vallgornera's attempt to enlist St. Thomas is specious but inconclusive, and he admits that the distinction is only hinted at.¹ The main tendency of mystical theology in the seventeenth century seems to have been to separate as far as possible mystical experience from the spiritual experience of ordinary Christians, to look on the graces which give rise to mystical experience as *gratiae gratis datae*, as extraordinary charismata, akin to the gifts of healing, of miracles, of prophecy, of tongues. Clearly, if that were so, the ordinary contemplation known and practised in hundreds of cloisters, the types of prayer common to the Visitation nuns during the lifetime of St. Francis de Sales and St. Chantal, could not be considered mystical. A new category had to be found, and acquired contemplation was invented to include the prayer of 'simple remise' of St. Francis de Sales and kindred types. The experience of souls had to be adjusted to a narrow mystical theory, a *via media* had to be found between meditation and ecstatic forms of prayer. Types of mental prayer were found among persons whose lives were a testimony that their prayer was unexceptionable, which had none of the discursive and multiplex features of meditation, and which were akin in simplicity to acknowledged mystical prayers, yet in which the conative element played a marked part and the consciously 'given' seemed absent. It seemed obvious that such prayers should be a class apart, they were active contemplation or acquired contemplation. The new category became classic, and the possibility and frequency of non-mystical contemplation was an accepted commonplace with spiritual writers until our own time.²

Père Poulain is perhaps the best accredited representative

¹ *Theologica Mystica*, Q. III. Disp. I. art. 4, p. 358, ed. Marietti, 1911.

² For the full criticism of this distinction the reader may usefully consult Saudreau, *Vie d'Union à Dieu* (Paris : Amat, 1909) ; De Besse, *La Science de la Prière* (Paris : Oudin, 1904) ; J. Delacroix, *Ascétique et Mystique* (Paris : Bloud, 1912) ; Lamballe, *La Contemplation* (Paris : Tequi, 1912).

of this view to-day. His great treatise, *Les Graces d'Oraison*, is a monument of industrious research and wide experience as a spiritual director. It will rank with Scaramelli's great work as a storehouse of experience, classified with great acumen, and quite indispensable to the student of mystical phenomena. As theorists there is much to criticise in both authors; but as shrewd, practical guides and industrious collectors and classifiers of varied types of spiritual experience, one has become a classic, and the other will be one in due course of time.

Now Père Poulain has devoted a long chapter to the prayer of simplicity which, with Scaramelli, he regards as non-mystical. With considerable skill he traces its development from the meditation by a process of gradual simplification. The meditation, a complex of considerations and affections, grows into affective prayer by a gradual reduction in the number of considerations.

The difference between this degree and meditation is only a matter of more or less. It is a discourse, only less varied and less apparent and leaving more room for sentiments of love, praise, gratitude, respect, submission, contrition, etc., and also for practical resolutions. The deduction of truths is partly replaced by intuition. From the intellectual point of view the soul becomes simplified. . . . But the simplification can be carried farther still, and may extend, in a certain measure, to the will, which then becomes satisfied with very little variety in the affections. There is nothing to prevent them from being very ardent at times, but they are usually produced without many words. This is what we call the Prayer of Simplicity, or of Simple Regard. It can be defined thus: a mental prayer where (i) intuition in a great measure replaces reasoning, (ii) the affections and resolutions show very little variety and are expressed in few words.¹

This only touches the matter on its negative side, Père Poulain completes it by declaring:—

In the prayer of simplicity there is a thought or a sentiment that returns incessantly and easily (although with little or no development) amongst many other thoughts, whether useful or not.

¹ *Les Graces d'Oraison*, 5th ed., chap. ii. par. 2 (C.T.S. booklet, *The Prayer of Simplicity*, p. 12).

This dominant thought does not go so far as to be continuous. It merely returns frequently and of its own accord. . . . The prayer of simple regard is really only a slow sequence of single glances cast upon one and the same object.¹

This degree differs from the preceding degrees only as the greater differs from the less. The persistence of our principal idea, however, and the vivid impression that it produces, point as a rule to an increased action on God's part.

An exaggerated picture of the prayer of simplicity has been drawn at times. It has been so described as to lead us to suppose that the intellect and the will continue inactive before a single idea. In this case the multiplicity of acts would have disappeared entirely and during the whole time that the prayer lasted ; whereas it has only diminished notably and for a certain time—long enough to draw attention to it. The simplicity is approximate only.²

If this be acquired contemplation, wherein does it differ psychologically from a meditation attenuated to a point ? It is difficult to see from Père Poulain's description any real difference. The attention, instead of wandering discursively over the religious field of consciousness, passing from one psychic element to another, combining and disintegrating them to form the final mental picture on which the soul's eye can rest, is fixed on some one psychic element which it draws from the storehouse of memory, and concentrates intelligence and will on this one point. The field is cleared not merely of distracting and importunate thoughts, as in the ordinary process of meditation, but all superfluous psychic elements are got rid of and the conscious field is reduced to a minimum. The mind's eye is focussed on a point and not suffered to wander. This involves the emptying of consciousness of all but the point under attention ; *it is not the kenosis of the whole field with attention in depth*. Clearly there is no mystical element, the whole process comes under the ordinary laws of psychology, and we have nothing mysterious, nothing

¹ 'C'est un tissu d'actes de foi et d'amour si simples, si directes, si paisibles et si uniformes qu'ils ne paroissent plus aux personnes ignorantes qu'un seul acte, ou même qu'ils ne paroissent faire aucun acte, mais un repos de pur union.'—Fénelon, *Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la Vie intérieure*, Édition critique publiée d'après des documents inédits par Albert Cherel. Paris : Bloud, 1911, p. 262.

² Poulain, l.c., C.T.S. booklet, p. 14.

hidden. If the prayer of '*simple remise*,' of Simplicity, of Simple Regard is only a meditation developed or attenuated to a point, we must admit the contention of those who declare that it is non-mystical.

'The persistence of one principal idea, however, and the vivid impression that it produces, point, as a rule, to an increased action on God's part.' We must note this statement of Père Poulain and see what it implies. One would naturally expect that the attenuation of the elements of a meditation to one point would lower the psychic dynamism of the idea, beget monotony and weariness. There is great psychic difficulty in prolonged attention to any one element in the field of consciousness, interest soon flags and distraction follows. A certain amount of change is necessary to hold attention and stimulate the will. But in the prayer of simplicity we have an almost static condition and yet of singular psychic dynamism. Père Poulain postulates increased action of grace, yet as grace follows nature is it not surprising that the increased action should follow a psychological handicap? Can we justly describe such action of the Divine as ordinary and non-mystical?

Again he speaks of a 'thought or sentiment that returns incessantly and easily,' does not this imply a certain passivity not quite ordinary? But his most remarkable admission is, perhaps, this:—

When this state has reached its full development, not only do certain acts of which I have just spoken become rare, but the attempt to produce them results in a feeling of impotence and distaste. And it is then the same also with those representations of the imagination which would aid other persons in their prayer.¹

What is this but the 'ligature' of the mystics? How can it possibly be ordinary and non-mystical? A most difficult psychic operation becomes not only easy, but the normal wandering off of the attention to features of natural interest is restrained. Clearly, in this prayer of simplicity,

¹ Poulain, l.c., C.T.S. booklet, p. 13.

the attention is either fixed and riveted by the extraordinary action of ordinary grace, sufficient to overcome the most natural and urgent impulses to distraction, a strengthening of the will to a marvellous degree, or we must admit in this prayer some element not reducible to the terms of an attenuated meditation. We have to choose between the miraculous and the mystical. Is it reasonable to suppose that grace acts in this prayer *qua* ordinary grace (never refused to anyone, as Père Poulain states in the second paragraph of his first chapter) in such an extraordinary way, bordering on the miraculous? Is it not more reasonable, more theological, to suppose that there is some new element contributed, not a mere reinforcement of the will only? Why attenuate the psychic dynamism of normal meditation, only to supply the deficiency by an extraordinary strengthening of the elements left? What would be gained by this process?¹

If we reject this view of the non-mystical character of the prayer of simplicity, we are forced to inquire—what is in the nature of this prayer which transcends an excessively simplified meditation? The description which Père Poulain gives is excellent, as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. He will not admit the existence of a mystical element in it; yet, when he comes to discuss the Dark Night of St. John of the Cross, he admits that to all appearance the ‘first night of St. John of the Cross is a prayer of simplicity, but having characteristics, two in especial, which make it a particular species; it is bitter, and it is to God alone, as a rule, that the simple regard is unceasingly directed.’² In a note he admits that St. John of the Cross puts the aridity of the night of sense as an immediate sequel to meditation, omitting affective prayer and the prayer of simplicity, as defined by Père Poulain. Further on Père Poulain argues that in the Dark Night there is a latent mystical element, an imperceptible prayer

¹ For further proofs of the essentially mystical character of the prayer of simplicity, see Lamballe, *La Contemplation* (Paris: Tequi, 1912, p. 92 et seq.).

² *Les Graces d'Oraison*, chap. xv. par. 3, 5th ed., p. 200.

of quiet.¹ Possibly he might have recognised this same latent mystical element in his own prayer of simplicity, if he had not decided *à priori* that it was an ordinary and non-mystical type of prayer. The same type of contemplation as described by Père de Besse and the Abbé Saudreau is much closer to St. John of the Cross, for these writers; unlike Père Poulain, have not made abstraction of the mystical quality.

What, then, is the latent element in the prayer of simplicity which marks it off psychologically from a simplified meditation? The persistence of the main idea and the incipient 'ligature' or inhibition, more or less marked, of certain normal psychic acts are those disturbances from which we may infer the presence of a new psychic element. Clearly the attention so firmly held and restrained from wandering is not fixed in the usual fashion. There is some new interest, something capable of putting all the forces of the soul in an 'unnatural' attitude, of fixing the wandering mind and gripping the wayward heart. It is an unseen interest, one hardly felt, yet its effects are ultra-dynamic. The conscious element, on which the mind *seems* focussed, is some old idea, time-honoured and well worn, the outcome of study, of previous meditations. It has nothing new in it, it is something trite and commonplace, its intellectual interest has been worked out by repetition, so that it has nothing of the nascent idea about it; nay more, it lacks the dynamic support of the normal field of consciousness from which it has been carefully filtered out. The conscious element, therefore, is psychically weak and cannot account for the interest which holds the whole soul fixed. An interest implies an object which excites interest, and this is not given in what is obvious to consciousness during this prayer. If it were it could be readily described, and there would be no mystery. It is not a simple reinforcement of the will by itself, for then the psychic feature of interest would not appear, but rather that of satisfaction in doing a dull duty. We must account for this sense of

¹ Poulain, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

interest, which is present in all mystical experience, although its extent varies as greatly as its other characteristics of joy and sorrow. What can this hidden object be, this true Beyond of consciousness, which can hold the attention of the soul to something unknown, beneath the trite and the commonplace, which can inflame the will to a degree surpassing all eloquent considerations of the reason, backed by the might of imagination and emotion? It can only be the Idea of God, presented to consciousness in a new mode, or rather *sine modo*.

Many abide in error, so that they come not to Contemplation, or to that which hath no Mode. Yet every hindrance is within themselves. They are disquieted at heart, Watching narrowly the deeds of others, Concerning themselves with the cares of their friends and kinsmen in which they have no part, Careful for their own necessities, Wherefore the riches of God are veiled from their eyes.¹

The idea of God may be developed in consciousness, either positively or negatively. His image may be formed, as by a painter, adding touch to touch, detail to detail; or as by a sculptor, cutting away whatever is superfluous, removing whatever does not belong to the Figure sought. In his commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, (i. 19), St. Thomas points out that 'there is something concerning God which must remain wholly unknown to man in this life, namely, what is God,' and the reason assigned is that

man's knowledge takes its beginning in those things which are connatural to him, namely the created objects of sense-perception, and these are not adequate to represent the Divine Essence. From these creatures man may rise to knowledge of God in three ways, as Dionysius declares in the book on the Divine Names. In one manner through the principle of causality. As such creatures are defective and changeable, it is necessary to bring them under some principle that is unmoved and perfect; and thus we know of God that He exists. Secondly, by the way of excellence. For all things are not brought under the one principle, as under a specific and homogeneous cause, as a man generates a man; but as under a

¹ Ruysbroeck, *The Book of the Twelve Beguines*, chap. vi. p. 65 (London: Watkins, 1913).

cause, inclusive of all yet exceeding all; and thus we know that God is above all things. Thirdly, by the way of negation; if the cause exceed all, nothing that is in creatures can appertain to it. . . . Thus we say of God that He is unmoved and has no bounds and such like.¹

In the *Summa Contra Gentiles* (Book i. chap. 14) St. Thomas declares that this way of negation, of removal, is the method which should be made use of when considering the Divine Substance.

For the Divine Substance by Its immensity exceeds every formal principle to which our intelligence can reach, and so we cannot apprehend It by knowing what It is, but we may have a sort of knowledge of It by knowing what It is not. We will become the more clearly aware of It, the more things we can take from It by our understanding; for we know anything the more perfectly, the more we recognise its differences from other things, for each thing has in itself something distinct from all other things.

In our ordinary knowledge we fine down our general concepts by adding the appropriate specific differences, until we reach the point when we can distinguish the object considered from all others. But in our knowledge of God we cannot proceed by genus and difference as a positive addition, we must effect the distinction from all other beings by negative differences.

Thus, if we say that God is not an accident, by this is He distinguished from all accidents. Then if we add that He is not a body, we further distinguish Him from some substances; and so step by step is He distinguished by these negations from everything except Himself; and then His substance may be rightly considered when it is known *as distinct from all*. This, however, will not be perfect knowledge, because He is not known *as He is in Himself*.

The positive mode of the formation of the idea of God in consciousness accords well with the discursive method of the meditation, and, when formed, the affirmative idea may well be the matter of contemplation. The prayer of simplicity, as restricted by Père Poulain, or as suggested in a tract by Bossuet² (which has been somewhat severely criticised

¹ Cited in Vallgornera, ed. Marietti, vol. i. p. 355.

² For this semi-quietist tract of Bossuet, see Roussel, *La Doctrine Spirituelle*, vol. ii. app. i. 'L'oraison en foi et de simple presence de Dieu,' par Bossuet (Paris: Lethielleux).

by Père de Maumigny¹), may have such an idea among others as its object. But such contemplation is not essentially mystical, for the object contemplated, a positive idea, comes well within the scope of ordinary psychic activity. It is in contemplation, *per viam negationis*, where the idea of God has been formed negatively, that we may find the true mystical type if we can succeed in excluding what may be termed philosophical contemplation or speculation.

The negative idea of God is the result of a process of abstraction pushed to the ultimate. As He transcends all creation, being the Creator, we arrive at the ultimate distinction, as pointed out in our quotations from the *Summa Contra Gentiles*, by a series of negations, by which we reject the Conditioned and the Relative in all their varied aspects. We thus, by a process of elimination, rise to the widest and most general concept of Being, but we have not yet reached the negative idea of God. Our notion of Being, in its widest and most unlimited form, is after all an idea or concept of created being, for it is derived by a process of psychic filtration from the manifold of sense by which we gain our knowledge of created things. Our utmost knowledge of all that is implied in the word 'is' comes from what we know of the Relative, it cannot reach the Absolute without transcending both the 'given' of experience and our own relativity, our limitations, our weakness. God is the Absolute, or He is not, and we can only express His Name in consciousness by a denial of the very ultimate of consciousness, the final elaboration of the idea of Being. The very word Absolute is a negative, and postulates the denial of the Relative. If we wish to discourse about it, we must express ourselves in negative propositions. We may consider it only indirectly, by denying of it all that we assert of the Relative, by emptying our experience of all its elements. If we fail to make this final kenosis, our idea of the Absolute is but a sublimation of the Relative: instead of

¹ *Pratique de l'Oraison mentale*, 2nd vol. p. 80 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1909).

an ultimate distinction we have a final unity, and we are Pantheists. If we attempt by mere force of reasoned abstraction to pass beyond our widest concept of Being, we are plunged in the void; blank nothingness confronts our consciousness, we are choked in a vacuum. There is no natural foothold for our minds in the Absolute, if we would reason about it we must descend to the planes of being, relative and limited, and argue by denial. Hence the nature of God, as given in philosophical speculation, is only known as something distinct from all, but cannot be known 'as He is in Himself.'

Moses said to God : Lo, I shall go to the children of Israel, and say to them : The God of your fathers hath sent me to you. If they should say to me : What is His name ? What shall I say to them ? God said to Moses : I Am Who Am. He said : Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel : He Who Is, hath sent me to you (Exod. iii. 13, 14). And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying : I am the Lord, that appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, by the name of God Almighty : and my name, Adonai, I did not show them (Exod. vi. 2, 3).

Adonai, Lord, the substitute read for the Ineffable Name, the proper Name of God, signifying His Eternal Self-existent Being, the name whose very sound is lost, the Jehovah of modern use being merely a version of the cryptogram of the Scribes.

We read in the life of St. Catherine of Sienna, by Blessed Raymond of Capua :

At the beginning of her Divine visions, that is to say at the time when Our Lord began to manifest Himself to the saint, He appeared to her one day when in prayer and said to her : Dost thou know, daughter, who thou art and Who I am ? If thou hast this double knowledge, thou wilt be blest. Thou art she who is not, I am He Who is. If thou keep fast this truth in thy soul, the enemy can never deceive thee, thou wilt escape all his snares ; never wilt thou consent to do aught against My commandments, and thou wilt attain without difficulty all grace, all truth, all light.¹

The aim of philosophical speculation is knowledge, the aim of mystical contemplation is love. The philosopher

¹ Chap. x., at the beginning.

seeks to know, to understand, to express his knowledge. He must needs, when he considers the Absolute, return again to that experience from which by negation he derived his idea. To understand we must see again our ideas in the phantasms or images from which we abstracted them, there must be a *conversio ad phantasmata*.¹ But the negative idea of God allows of no such image in which the idea is mirrored ; we must revert to a lower plane of experience. The mystic must do likewise if he desires to express his experience, hence the stream of negations and aequipollent negations that we find in mystics like Ruysbroeck. They describe their experience by denying the given of a lower experience.

If anyone, seeing God, knows what he sees, it is by no means God that he so sees, but something created and knowable. For God abides above created intellect and existence, and is in such sense unknowable and non-existent that He exists above all existence and is known above all power of knowledge. Thus the knowledge of Him Who is above all that can be known is for the most part ignorance.²

We have thus a certain parallelism between the mystical idea of God and the philosopher's ultimate conception of the Absolute. When an effort is made to describe the experience of the mystic and to set forth our least inadequate concept of the Divinity attainable by reason, we find a certain similarity. But in the two experiences there is a vast difference. The Mystic is in love, the Philosopher seeks to know. To the former the experience is real, is lived ; to the latter it is a notion, expressed in consciousness by a negation, laboriously elaborated from more psychically real experiences. The philosopher labours upward, climbing from negation to negation until he attains the ultimate of denial. Although his result expresses the Most Awful Actuality, the Only Ultimately Real, He Who Is, in consciousness it remains the emptiest of notions, only dimly recognised, if at all, in the denial of the given of all experience. For the Mystic this negative idea is the Finger of the Most

¹ Cf. *Summa Theologiæ*, D. Thomæ Aquinatis, i. q. 84, a. 7.

² Dionysius the Areopagite, Letter I.

High touching his inmost being, and his heart blazes at the touch. He does not seek to know. 'I am the most foolish of men and the wisdom of men is not with me. I have not learned wisdom, and have not known the science of saints' (Prov. xxx. 2, 3). To know, he would have to turn again to the created, to avert his gaze from God revealed to his heart. For the philosopher the kenosis of consciousness is but a dialectical process, for the mystic it is a vital necessity that his heart may feel what his mind cannot grasp.

For this reason, then, if anyone is moved to love God by that sweetness he feels, he casts that sweetness away from him, and fixes his love upon God, Whom he does not feel; but if he allowed himself to rest in that sweetness and delight which he feels, dwelling upon them with satisfaction, that would be to love the creature, and that which is of it, and to make the motive an end, and the act of the will would be vitiated; for, as God is incomprehensible and unapproachable, the will, in order to direct its act of love unto God, must not direct it to that which is tangible and capable of being reached by the desire, but must direct it to that which it cannot comprehend nor reach thereby. In this way the will loves that which is certain and true, according to the spirit of the faith, in emptiness and darkness as to its own feelings, above all that it can understand by the operations of the understanding; its faith and love transcend all that it can comprehend.¹

The psychic paradox of mystical experience is that an idea, so empty of all psychically positive elements, so essentially unintelligible, should exercise such dynamic influence on the will. It would seem to contradict the maxim, *nil volitum nisi precognitum*.² All the records of mystical experience go to show the excessive nature of the love generated by this imperceptible cognition, if we may so call it. The cognitive element is so delicate, so difficult to grasp or to express, that many, with St. Bonaventure,³ looked on the element of love as given apart from knowledge, a view vehemently combated by the Thomists, who postulated the gift of a higher

¹ St. John of the Cross, Letter X (p. 162 of *The Living Flame*. London: Baker, 1912).

² See St. John of the Cross's commentary on this maxim, *Spiritual Canticles*, stan. xxvi. 6, p. 203 (Baker's edition).

³ See Meynard, *Traité de la Vie Intérieure* (Paris: Amat, 1913, p. 27).

knowledge to account for the outburst of love which is the most palpable feature of mystical experience. But the negative idea of God would constitute this higher knowledge and yet be so imperceptible as to justify in a measure those who perceived the love and failed to notice the knowledge.

In our ordinary psychic life we love that which we know and we have knowledge of that which we love. With the motion of the will we have the antecedent word of the understanding. The acts of the will and of the intellect can be distinguished in consciousness, we can look on them in their relation of antecedent and consequent, of cause and effect. But in mystical experience we can find no formulated word of the understanding, while the motion of the will is evident. If we postulate the two acts we must assume a fusion, a union as of matter and form, of body and soul. Blossius assumes that in the hidden depth of the soul the higher intellectual powers, the memory, understanding and will, become as one.¹ Lopez Ezquerria turns the difficulty by assuming that direct acts are more effective and less observed than reflex acts and that knowledge in mystical contemplation is unnoticed, being a most direct act of the intelligence.²

If we postulate the existence of the negative idea of God, can it not act directly on the will without prior formulation as a word of the understanding? From the given of sense we abstract the inchoate concept, we filter out the individuating elements, and the essential residue bumps into our intelligence, which vitally reacts to the impression by forming the word of the mind, the concept which expresses the universal which was wrapped up in the individual. By the idea thus formed and expressed the will is attracted or repelled, freely, as by something apprehended, for we can choose since we know. We can alter our field of consciousness, we can change the idea presented, or we can consider its repellent or attractive aspects and increase or diminish their dynamism by our attention. But we cannot

¹ *Inst. Spirit.*, c. 12, quoted Meynard, p. 35.

² *Lucerna Mystica*, Tr. 2, c. 9, no. 79, quoted Meynard, p. 45.

do this with the negative idea of God, it does not become a word of the understanding, for the intellect is too feeble to react to the impression. If we could form a *verbum mentis* it would be a blank, a complete void of all human meaning, a something or rather a nothing absolutely inert on the will. The negative idea fails to become a *species impressa* for the intelligence, the stamp strikes the will direct. It is the will which vitally reacts to the negative idea of God by an act of love and in that act the intelligence gleans knowledge.¹

How is this theory compatible with freedom? How can there be a choice if the negative idea, unformulated by the understanding into a word of the mind, acts directly on the will? It will be the unique object of the will and so must determine it. How is freedom, and its corollary merit, to be saved? Respondeo dicendum: quidquid recipitur recipitur per modum recipientis. The will which can receive and be moved by the negative idea of God is a somewhat different will from that which is moved by the positive ideas of normal psychic experience. It is a will emptied of all affections for the created universe of things considered in themselves; not merely, as in ordinary moral ascesis, of all inordinate affections but of all natural affection which rests in the creature.

It is, therefore, plain that no distinct object whatever that pleases the will can be God; and for that reason, if it is to be united with Him, it must empty itself, cast away every disorderly affection of the desire, every satisfaction it may distinctly have, high and low, temporal and spiritual, so that, purified and cleansed from all unruly satisfactions, joys, and desires, it may be wholly occupied, with all its affections, in loving God. For if the will can in any way comprehend God and be united with Him, it cannot be through any capacity of the desire, but only by love; and as all delight, sweetness and joy, of which the will is sensible, is not love, it follows that none of these pleasing impressions can be the adequate means of uniting the will to God; the means are an act of the will. And because an act of the will is quite distinct from feeling: it is by an

¹ Cf. St. John of the Cross, *The Living Flame*, stanza iii. § 51 (London: Baker 1912, p. 90). Also *Spiritual Canticles*, stanzas xiv, xv, § 19 et seq.

act that the will is united with God, and rests in Him ; that act is love. This union is never wrought by feeling, or exertions of the desire, for these remain in the soul as aims and ends.¹

Again and again St. John of the Cross insists on this total purification of the will from all attachment to the created, to everything that is not God, and above all to self. 'The goods of God, which are beyond all measure, can be contained only in an empty and solitary heart' (Maxim 349). Again, in the *Ascent of Carmel*: 'Does it make any difference whether a bird be held by a slender thread or by a rope. . . . This is the state of a soul with particular attachments : it can never attain to the liberty of the divine union, whatever virtues it may possess.' The kenosis of the will is far more important than that of the memory and the intellect in the general clearance of the field of consciousness. Ideas may be forgotten, but appetites are insistent. Our likes and dislikes, our loves and hates, have all the abounding vitality of weeds ; we may root them up, but if we leave a fragment of root it will sprout.

Hence it is for all mystics that the preparation of the will is the most essential part. If the will be not fitted to respond to the negative imprint by being cleared of all positive attachment, it cannot be determined by it. God will not be thrust into the mean chamber of a servant, into the lumber-room of self.

One desire only does God allow, and suffer in His presence, within the soul—the desire of keeping the law perfectly, and carrying the cross of Christ. It is not said, in the sacred writings, that God commanded anything to be laid up in the ark with the manna except the book of the law and the rod of Moses, a type of the cross of Christ (Maxim 342).

Such kenosis of the will is surely the most free of all human acts *to omit*, as it is the most difficult to effect, and hence in mystical experience the will is determined by the negative idea of God only because it wills to receive it. Thus even in ecstasy God is freely served.

¹ St. John of the Cross, Letter X (*The Living Flame*, p. 161).

This difficulty in the preparation of the will also meets the further objection that this theory of the negative idea of God imprinted directly on the will would justify the Quietists. Their root error was the claim to reach mystical experience by an active kenotic process. By creating a mental blank they claimed to find God experimentally. No doubt the mental blank can be created and a state of psychic lethargy attained, but unless the negative idea can be found and impressed on the will, detached from everything including self, the result will only be a psychic coma more or less. Can we by our own efforts form the negative idea, can we effect the purification of the will to the extent needed to receive the impress? A suitable philosophical dialectic can give us the negative idea, but only as a negative. The psychic paradox of mystical experience is that a negative idea should have a positive reaction on the will without recourse to the lower experience from which it was derived by negation. The intellect can only save itself from collapse before the void by this turning back, how then can it render dynamic what it cannot express? Is not the negative idea for the philosopher rather a psychic hypothesis than a psychic fact? For the mystic it is *the* fact, something given in experience, not inferred. It is but in externals that the idea of God of the mystic agrees with the ultimate conception of the philosopher, their dynamism is totally different and their psychic genesis. The philosopher elaborates his notion, to the mystic it comes as something given, as something often unexpected. It serves the philosopher as matter for discourse, for knowledge; it reduces the mystic's soul to silence and the unknowable is known in love. It is a conscious construction with the philosopher; for the mystic it is something dimly perceived in its effects. The philosopher must revert to a lower plane of experience if he would mentally realise his highest concept, the mystic must not look back if he would retain the gift.

It is evident, therefore, that if the soul does not now abandon its ordinary way of meditation, it will receive this gift of God in a scanty and imperfect manner, not in that perfection with which it

is bestowed ; for the gift being so grand, and an infused gift, cannot be received in this scanty and imperfect way. Consequently, if the soul will at this time make efforts of its own, and encourage another disposition than that of passive loving attention, most submissive and calm, and if it does not abstain from its previous discursive acts, it will place a barrier against those graces which God is about to communicate to it in this loving knowledge.¹

It is by the reaction of his will that the mystic perceives the presence of the negative idea. St. Bernard in his commentary on the Canticle of Canticles declares, 'The Word, the Spouse, coming into the depths of my soul has never made known His Presence to me by extraordinary means, neither by voice, nor by forms. I have felt His touch only in the movement of my heart, and I have found the might of His presence in the correction of my vices.' The mystical experience comes suddenly and goes suddenly.² The discernment of the negative idea is only an analytical afterthought, when the soul tries to recall its experience and to describe it, if only to itself. The primarily conscious feature is the motion of the will, its fixation by something beyond the powers of ordinary speech to describe, save in negatives. The negative idea is not *in consciousness* before the reaction of the will, it becomes dimly visible in that very reaction. It is inferred before it is perceived, if it can be truly said to be perceived. It is elusive and evades reflection, yet it is felt as an energetic reality. No process of abstraction will ensure its advent, no storm of distracting images can drive it away when the will is held fast, yet it will fly at the least wilful infidelity. Clearly this is not the philosophical notion of the Absolute : it is a something given, not derived.

Even if the Quietist could arrive at the negative idea, could he hope to adjust his will to the delicate temper fitted to receive it ? Is it so easy to make abstraction of self in our affective part ? We may abolish the 'I' by enthusiastic resolutions, we may even try to crush it by a long asceticism, moral and psychic, such as St. John has given

¹ St. John of the Cross, *The Living Flame*, stan. iii. § 37.

² Cf. Poulain, *Les Graces d'Oraison*, chap. vii. par. 5, 5th ed. p. 111.

in details which terrify and even scandalise the ordinary devout Christian, in his *Ascent of Carmel*, and yet we may fail, and most probably will fail, to disintegrate that self which is our worst and most subtle enemy. Only by the truly horrible passive purgations of the Dark Night can self be finally destroyed so as to leave the will a fitting instrument for grace. Those who look on mystical experience as ecstatic hedonism should read that work of St. John of the Cross; it will enlighten them as to the sufferings of contemplatives. St. Teresa is as emphatic.

Daughters, I assure those of you whom God does not lead by the way of contemplation, that, both by observation and experience, I know that those following it do not bear a lighter cross than you: but indeed you would be aghast at the different kinds of trials God sends them. I know a great deal of both vocations, and am well aware that the sufferings God inflicts on contemplatives are of so unbearable a kind that, unless He sustained such souls by the manna of divine consolations, they would find their pains insupportable.¹

These sufferings were of no brief duration in the case of the greater mystical saints. St. Teresa endured them for eighteen years, St. Francis of Assisi for two, St. Clair of Monte-Falco for fifteen, St. Catharine of Bologna for five, St. Mary of Egypt for seventeen, St. Magdalen de Pazzi for five, to begin with, then for sixteen, Blessed Henry Suso for ten.² This Divine training of the will through suffering would be a needless cruelty if the will could be purified by resolution or a modest ascesis. There is no short and easy route up the mount of contemplation.

Blessed Albertus Magnus, in his commentary on the *Mystical Theology* of Dionysius, seems to insinuate the notion we have put forward, that the negative idea of God in mystical experience is a positive psychic element.

There is no pure negation, but the receiving of a certain habitual light through which we draw near to the act of divine vision . . . it is no mere negation, but the mode of natural vision is denied, and the reception of supernatural light is left, which is the better

¹ *Way of Perfection*, chap. xviii. par. 1, p. 112 (Baker, 1911).

² Meynard, *De la Vie Intérieure*, vol. ii. p. 161.

signified by negation, because we do not find then anything known to us which we may with propriety predicate of God, on account of the eminence of His Simplicity, since the truth of the predication would rest on composition with an idea other than God (*cum praedicationis veritas fundetur in alia compositione*): but, as Gregory says, 'we sing stammering the high things of God.'¹

Denis the Carthusian, in his commentary on the same work, puts the point still more forcibly:—

In contemplation or mystical vision, when God is known by the withdrawal and denial of all things, He is known and seen more clearly and sublimely than in that contemplation called affirmative, so also objectively, yet not as What He is, but that He Is, yet with a large approach to the knowledge of His Essence. Nevertheless in this contemplation the apex of the mind and the vertex of the intelligence is brought to union with God as wholly Unknown, and is plunged likewise wholly in darkness, and knows nothing whatsoever of Him; not that it wholly withdraws from regarding Him; seeing that this contemplation, knowledge and vision of the Deity is the highest, brightest, most perfect and deepest possible in this life, as Dionysius himself and his exponents testify; but because in this contemplative union with God, which is most full of wisdom and fire, the mind sees most sharply and clearly how beyond all comprehension, beyond all glory, beyond all brightness, beyond all beauty, beyond all things lovable, and beyond all things that give joy is the Lord God Himself, Omnipotent and Measureless; and how infinitely and incredibly it falls short and fails and is held from that full knowledge of Him, that blessed enjoyment of Him, the vision face to face immediate and direct.²

It must be remembered that this text is the formulation of a spiritual experience, not a mere abstract speculation. Like the Dionysius he is expounding, the explosion of superlatives reveals something more than a merely philosophical inference from a negative and abstract notion. It is an attempt to supply the reason why of an experience, vital and inexpressible, the reaction of the mind to the negative idea of God.

¹ B. Albertus Magnus, *De Myst. Theol. S. Dionys.*, c. 2, n. 2, d. 1, ad 2 et 3, quoted Vives, *Compendium Theologiae Ascetica-Mysticae*, p. 379 (Rome: Pustet, 1908).

² B. Dion. Carth. in com. de Myst. Theol., a. 8, quoted in footnote in Vives, *Compendium Theol. Ascetica-Mysticae*, p. 179.

The union of intelligence and will, in one act, we find, likewise, in Blossius.

Few rise above their natural powers (and truly no one of himself by his own endeavour can pass beyond them, but God alone raises the man of persevering, humble prayer who does all that he can above them); few know of the *supreme affection*, the *simple intelligence*, the *apex of the spirit* and the *hidden depth* of the soul. In truth you cannot persuade most people that this depth is in us. For it is further within and more elevated than are the three higher powers of the soul, for it is the source of these powers. It is wholly simple, essential and uniform. Wherefore in it there is not multiplicity, but unity, and those three higher powers are one. Here is the highest tranquillity, the highest silence, since no image can come here. By this depth (in which the Divine image is hidden) we are like unto God. The same depth which stretches to an abyss is called the heaven of the spirit, for in it is the kingdom of God, according to the saying of our Lord: *The Kingdom of God is within you*. But the Kingdom of God is God Himself with all His riches. Therefore that bare and unfigured depth is raised above all created things and above all the senses and powers of the soul, it transcends place and time, resting in a perpetual adhesion to God as its beginning; but it is essentially within us, as it is the abyss of the soul and its inmost essence. This depth, which the Uncreated Light continually illuminates, when it is opened to man and begins to shine for him, marvellously affects and attracts him.¹

JOHN HOWLEY.

¹ Blossius, *Inst. Spirit.*, c. 12, quoted Meynard, p. 35.

SOME INSCRIPTIONS FROM LOUVAIN

By SHANE LESLIE

DURING my last visit to Louvain, then a city of peace and study, I spent an afternoon copying the memorials in the old Irish Convent of St. Anthony of Padua. The College was founded by Archbishop Florence Conry, who was born in Galway in 1560. He is mentioned in the *Annals of the Four Masters* as Confessor of Hugh Roe O'Donnell. He was the author of the *Mirror of Religion* (*Scathan an Chrabhuidh*), one of the first Irish books printed on the Continent, and of a *Compendium to St. Augustine*, whose works, we are told, he read seven times. One wonders how many people in the world have read them even once ! He was made Archbishop of Tuam by Pope Paul V, but he was never able to visit his See. This inscription is the most conspicuous in the old chapel of the College. Others exist behind pictures, in passages, let into walls and floors. They convey their own story—that of the wife of Owen Roe O'Neill and of Lieut.-Colonel Burke amongst them.

D O M

ILL^S AC R^{MS} P. F. FLORENTI^S CONRI^S CONACIEN. ORD. MIN. R.
OBSER^Æ

ARCHIEP^S TVAMEN PROV^Æ HIB^Æ QVONDAM MÑR

PIET^Æ DOCT^A PRUD^A MAX. ÆTER^A MEM^A DIGN^{MS}

QVO SOLICITÂTE PRO RESTAVRÂDA IN HIB^A FIDE ORTHOD^A
HOC S^{MI} ANT. A PAD. COLL^A MVNIFICEN^A PHIL. III. HISP. REGIS

FUNDATV̄. EST AN. CHRISTI M.DC.VI.

LABORIBVS VARIIS FIDEI ET PATRIÆ ERGO FRACTVS
PIE OBIIT IN CONV. S^{MI} FRAN. MADRITI ANNO M.DC.XXIX

XIV. KAL. DEC. ÆTAT. LXIX. ARCHIEP^{TS} XXI

HVI^S COLL. P.P. ANNO M.DC.LIV. QVO EI^S OSSA

EX HISP^A TRANSLATA, ET HIC IMMORTAL^{TIS}

PRÆMI^M EXPECTÂT GRATI POSVERE

[The most illustrious and reverend Father Florence Conry, of Connaught, of the regular observance of the Minor Order, Archbishop

of Tuam, formerly of the Irish Province, for his great Piety, Doctrine, and Prudence most worthy of eternal memory. Owing to his solicitude to restore the orthodox Faith in Ireland this College of St. Anthony of Padua was founded by the munificence of Philip III, King of Spain, in the year of Christ 1606. Broken by his varied labours for Faith and Fatherland, he died piously in the Convent of St. Francis, at Madrid, in the year 1629, Fourteen days to the Kalends of December, in the 69th year of his age and the 22nd of the Archiepiscopate. In the year 1654 the grateful Fathers of this College placed this where his bones were translated from Spain, and await the reward of Immortality.]

D O M
HIC VT VOLUIT JACET
PRAENOBILIS DOMINUS D.
DOMINICUS LYNCH EX NOBILI
LYNCEORNUM GALVIENSIS
FAMILIA HIBERNIÆ LEGIONIS
DE LALLY VICE COLONELLUS
QUI PLURIMIS PRO PRINCIPE
CAROLO STUART IN SCOTIA
PERACTIS ET HONORIBUS
POSTEA VULNERATUS IN PRAELIO
LAFELTENSI DIE 21ST JULY 1747
OBYT LOVANY DIE 28TH
AUGUSTI EJUSDEM ANNI
R I P

[Here lies, as he wished, the very noble Lord Dominic Lynch, from the noble family of the Lynches of Galway, Lieutenant-Colonel of Lally's Irish Brigade, who endured much and with honour for his Sovereign Charles Stuart, in Scotland, and was afterwards wounded at the battle of Lafelt, the 21st day of July, 1747, and died in Louvain the 28th day of August in the same year.]

D O M
HIC IACET, VT VOLVIT,
ILL^{MS} AC R^{MS} D. FR.
DOMINIC^S DE BURGO
NOBILIS FAMILIÆ,
EX S. ORD. PRÆD.
EP^VS ELFINENSIS
IN HIBERNIA,
QVI PRO DEO ET REGE
SUO PLVRIMA PASSVS,
PROFVGUS OBIIT
IN HOC COLLEGIO LOV.
S. ANTONII DE PAD.
FR^VM. MIN. HIB.
DIE 1^B ANNI 1704 AET. 75
R I P A

[Here lies, as he wished, the most illustrious and reverend Sir, Brother Dominic, of the noble family of Burke, of the Holy Order of Preachers, Bishop of Elphin, in Ireland, who suffered many things for his God and King, and died an exile in this College at Louvain of St. Anthony of Padua, of the Friars Minor of Ireland, on the — day of January, in the year 1704, and at the age of 75.]

D O M

EXC^{MA} D. ROSA DOCHARTY
 DYNASTAR. INISONIÆ FILIA ET SOROR
 ALTI SANG^S DEC. MOR. TEMPER^A
 ET SPLENDIDIS CONJVGIIIS AVXIT
 PRIMVM NVPTA INCLYTO HEROI
 D. CAFFARRO ODONELL
 TIRCONALLIÆ PRINCIPIS GERMANO
 DEIN EXC^{MO} D. EVGENIO ONEILL
 CATHOLICI IN VLTONIA EXERCITV^S
 ARCHISTRATEGO VTRAMQ FORTVNA
 EXPERTA ET MISERIAM RATA
 COELVM STVDVIT BENEFACTIS MERERI
 SEPTUAG^A MAIOR DENATA
 BRUXELLIS I NOV. AN. MDCLX
 SVO CVM PRIMOGENITO HVGONE
 O DONELLO PRÆSTOLATVR HIC
 CARNIS RESURR^{AM}

[The most excellent Lady Rose O'Dogherty, the daughter and sister of the Princes of Inishowen. To the character of her high blood she added prudence and splendid marriages, marrying first the noble Hero Lord Caffary O'Donnell, a cousin of the Prince of Tir Connell, secondly the most excellent Lord Owen O'Neill, Commander-in-Chief of the Catholic army in Ulster. She endured both kinds of Fortune, and considering her misery, studied to win Heaven by good deeds. She died at Brussels, more than seventy years old, on November 1, in the year 1660. With her first-born, Hugh O'Donnell, she forewaits the Resurrection of the Flesh.]

D O M

HIC JACET V. P^R FRAN^S
 STUART BIBLIOTH^S &
 ARCHIVISTA QUEM
 IN JUVENTVTIS FLORE
 RAPUIT INVIDA MORS
 DIE 22 7BRIS 1783
 ÆTATIS SUE 27 RELIG.
 PROF. 8 SACERDOTII VERO

R I P

Here lies the venerable Father Francis Stuart, Librarian and Archivist, whom envious Death snatched in the Flower of his youth

on the 22nd day of September, 1783, in the 27th of his age, of his Religious Profession the 8th, and of his Priesthood truly —.]

D O M
HIC JACET V. P. SIMON
OREILLY PHIL^æ L^æ
BIBLIOTHEC^s & ARCHIVISTA
ACTUALIS OBIT 26 8BRIS
1773 ANNO ÆTATIS SUÆ
31 RELIG^æ PROF^s 17

[Here lies the venerable Father Simon O'Reilly, Reader in Philosophy, working Librarian and Archivist. He died the 26th of October, 1773, in the 31st year of his age and the 17th of his Religious Profession.]

✠
R A P
JOAN BAP
ODONELL JUB
MISSIONE EMERITUS
PROIA^æ HIBER. Q.
OLIM MINISTERET.
OB. 3 APR. 1714
R I M

[John Baptist O'Donnell, Jubilate Reader, retired from the mission of the Irish Province, where he formerly served. He died April 3, 1714.]

✠
V A P
FRAN^s TULLY
S. THEO. LR
EMERITUS ETC
OB 15 MART^y 1715
R I P

[Francis Tully, Reader in Sacred Theology, retired, etc. He died March 15, 1715.]

SHANE LESLIE.

DOCUMENTS

STATEMENT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE IRISH BISHOPS

(January 19, 1915)

[The following statement and resolutions were adopted at the meeting of the Standing Committee of the Bishops of Ireland, held at Dublin on Tuesday, January 19.]

THE INTERMEDIATE GRANT

Attempts have recently been made in the Press to fasten on the Irish Hierarchy part of the responsibility for the grievances of lay teachers in Irish Secondary schools, and, consequently, the Standing Committee of the Bishops think it right to re-state their position in regard to this question.

1. They are not only willing, but anxious, in the public interest, that all teachers, lay and clerical, without distinction, should be granted facilities for training, an official status by means of a register, reasonable security of tenure, adequate remuneration, and a right to a pension; and they recognise that till these rights have been secured to the reasonable satisfaction of the teachers their grievances will be such as to call for immediate redress.

2. They are satisfied that, owing to the poverty of the classes from which the pupils are drawn, and the general absence of charitable endowments by reason of past confiscations, in the case especially of Catholic schools, it is impossible to redress these grievances until the schools receive a State grant equivalent to that given in England and Scotland. Such a grant would amount not to £40,000, but, according to a computation that seems reliable, to above £154,000 a year. They know, of their own knowledge, many cases in which the income of the schools has been supplemented from private sources in order to pay even the present inadequate salaries; and they are certain that there is scarcely a school in Ireland that can afford, from the pensions of the pupils and the annual Intermediate and Department Grants, to provide a living wage for its teachers, and still less a pension, though every penny goes to the school, and no interest is charged on the capital outlay on buildings, equipment, and the like. They believe, further, that in the past, especially before any State-aid was received, the number of lay

teachers would have been much larger if the schools could have afforded a living wage and a pension, or if lay teachers could have accepted, as in the public interest the clergy often had to accept, a salary of £40 a year, with maintenance, or maintenance without salary.

3. They consider that any discrimination by the State, in point of status, tenure, remuneration, or pension, between lay and clerical teachers doing equal work in State-aided schools, is unjust to the clergy, against whom the discrimination is directed, and that, at all events in the form first proposed in connexion with the grant of £40,000, it is subversive of the necessary freedom of the schools to choose the best teaching talent, whether lay or clerical, and destructive of some of the smaller schools, whose income would not suffice to provide even one minimum salary.

4. At the same time they are willing that the Catholic schools, as a group, should undertake from the outset to use their share of this grant to provide the minimum salaries of the White Paper for as many qualified lay teachers having such tenure as the original condition of one lay teacher for every forty pupils in each separate school would require. Further, though one to forty in each separate school is equal to only one to sixty in the aggregate of schools, they are willing to accept the condition of one to fifty in the aggregate, which, they understand, has recently been submitted to the Treasury.

5. They are obliged to add that they accept this compromise, not because they think it just to the clergy, or fair in point of gratitude for their past services, but solely in the interest of a temporary settlement, and in the hope that when a register has been formed, it will be found possible, by general consent, to eliminate the extremely objectionable discrimination between laymen and clerics doing equal work in the schools of the country.

URGENT NEED OF NAVY CHAPLAINS

Scarcely any of the catastrophes that occur in the course of a great war so appal the minds of the people as the destruction, now so rapid, of a battleship with all its freight of brave men. If soldiers in the trenches need to be well prepared to meet death by the timely ministrations of religion, the sailors in the fighting line at sea stand no less in need of proper facilities to receive the last Sacraments.

Yet it is within our knowledge that Catholics wounded in the fleet since this devastating war began had no opportunity to see a chaplain for months before they were confronted with death.

Therefore, as pastors of our brave men, who are so heroic in the service of the State, we will not, and cannot, cease to cry out till their spiritual rights are duly protected.

A much larger number of chaplains and much improved facilities are absolutely necessary. Something has to be done at once, corresponding with what has been recently arranged with great advantage, as we gladly recognise, for supplying the ministrations of religion to Catholics in hospital and in the field.

DAY OF EXPIATION AND INTERCESSION

The Episcopal Standing Committee recommend that the First Sunday of Lent¹ be appointed as a Day of Public Expiation and Intercession to plead with God for peace, for the spiritual and temporal welfare of those engaged in the war, for the relatives and friends of those who have been killed or wounded, that the merciful God may comfort and strengthen them to bear their affliction with patience and resignation, and for the repose of the souls of the soldiers and sailors who have lost their lives in the war.

They recommend that the devotional services consist of Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for some hours, the recital of the Litany of the Saints and of Pope Benedict's prayer for peace,² and of Solemn Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

THE WAR REFUGEES' COMMITTEE

The Standing Committee of the Bishops have heard with satisfaction of the good work the War Refugees' Committee in Ireland have been doing for the support and relief of the afflicted Belgians who have sought refuge in our country, and they commend the organisation to the continued sympathy and support of the people.

✠ MICHAEL CARDINAL LOGUE, *Chairman.*

✠ RICHARD ALPHONSUS,	} <i>Secretaries.</i>
<i>Bishop of Waterford,</i>	
✠ ROBERT,	
<i>Bishop of Cloyne,</i>	

¹ Extract from a letter of His Eminence Cardinal Logue to the Press (January 25, 1915) changing the 'Day of Expiation' to Sexagesima Sunday, in accordance with the decree of the Pope as given on p. 212 *infra*:—" . . . It has since transpired that our Holy Father, Benedict XV, has appointed Sunday, the 7th February, as a Day of General Expiation for all Europe. Hence I believe that I interpret the wish of the Bishops by fixing Sunday, the 7th of February, instead of the first Sunday of Lent as the Day of "Public Expiation and Intercession" here in Ireland. The time being so short to make special arrangements, I believe it would very much convenience the Bishops if the reverend clergy would take this intimation as applying to all."

² See p. 213 *infra*.

DECREE OF BENEDICT XV, APPOINTING SEXAGESIMA SUNDAY
(FEBRUARY 7, 1915) AS A DAY OF EXPIATION AND INTER-
CESSION FOR PEACE IN ALL EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

(January 10, 1915)

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV

DECRETUM

PRECES PRO PACE CERTIS DIEBUS DICENDAE PRAESCRIBUNTUR

(OFFICIAL VERSION)

DECREE

His Holiness our Sovereign Lord, Pope Benedict XV, in deep affliction at the sight of a war which destroys thousands of young lives, brings misery to families and cities, and rushes flourishing nations to the brink of ruin, yet bearing in mind that Almighty God, Whose prerogative it is to heal by chastisement and through pardon to preserve, is moved by the prayers which spring from contrite and humble hearts, desires ardently that above the clang of arms may be heard the voice of Faith, Hope, and Charity, alone capable of welding together the hearts of men in one mind and one spirit. Therefore, while He exhorts the clergy and the faithful of the whole world to works of mortification and piety in expiation for the sins by which we have called down upon ourselves the just wrath of God, the Holy Father has ordained that throughout the Catholic Church solemn prayers shall be offered in order to obtain from the mercy of Almighty God the peace which all desire.

For this purpose it is hereby decreed that in every Metropolitan Cathedral, Parochial and Conventual Church in all European countries, on the 7th day of February next (being the Sunday called Sexagesima), and in all dioceses situated outside of Europe on the 21st day of March (being Passion Sunday), there shall be celebrated special religious functions in the following order :

In the morning, immediately after the Conventual or Parochial Mass, the Most Blessed Sacrament shall be exposed with all solemnity, and duly incensed ; after which the Psalm *Miserere mei, Deus* (Ps. 50) shall be sung with the Antiphon : *Da pacem, Domine, in diebus nostris, quia non est alius qui pugnet pro nobis nisi tu, Deus noster*, followed by the *V. Fiat pax in virtute tua, R. Et abundantia in turribus tuis* ; and the Collect, *Deus, a quo sancta desideria*, etc.

The Most Blessed Sacrament shall then remain exposed to public veneration till evening ; and it is desirable that arrangements be made whereby children also should take due part in the public adoration.

In the evening, previously to the deposition of the Most Blessed Sacrament, the third part of the Rosary is to be recited, followed

by the annexed prayer, expressly composed by His Holiness in order to obtain the benefit of peace ; then the Litanies of the Saints, according to the form prescribed for the devotion of the Forty Hours' Prayer in the *Rituale Romanum* of the year 1913. Immediately after the Litanies shall be sung the *Parce, Domine, parce populo tuo ; ne in aeternum irascaris nobis*, with the Versicles and Prayer usually recited after the Procession in *quacumque tribulatione* as in the *Rituale Romanum*, with the addition of the Collect *Deus, a quo sancta desideria*. The sacred function shall conclude with the *Tantum Ergo* and Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament, *more solito*.

In the hope that Almighty God may pour forth in yet greater abundance His Divine Grace, the Sovereign Pontiff exhorts the faithful to approach the Sacrament of Penance and to receive Holy Communion, and grants to all those who, after Confession and Communion, shall assist at one or other of the sacred functions as above ordered, or shall pray for some time before the Most Blessed Sacrament while solemnly exposed, a Plenary Indulgence.

From the Vatican, January 10, 1915.

PETER CARDINAL GASPARRI,
Secretary of State.

PRAYER

Dismayed by the horrors of a war which is bringing ruin to peoples and nations, we turn, O Jesus, to Thy most loving Heart as to our last hope. O God of Mercy, with tears we invoke Thee to end this fearful scourge ; O King of Peace, we humbly implore the peace for which we long. From thy Sacred Heart Thou didst shed forth over the world divine charity, so that discord might end and love alone might reign among men. During Thy life on earth Thy Heart beat with tender compassion for the sorrows of men ; in this hour, made terrible with burning hate, with bloodshed and with slaughter, once more may Thy Divine Heart be moved to pity. Pity the countless mothers in anguish for the fate of their sons ; pity the numberless families now bereaved of their fathers ; pity Europe, over which broods such havoc and disaster. Do Thou inspire rulers and peoples with counsels of meekness, do Thou heal the discords that tear the nations asunder ; Thou Who didst shed Thy Precious Blood that they might live as brothers, bring men together once more in loving harmony. And as once before, to the cry of the Apostle Peter : *Save us, Lord, we perish*, Thou didst answer with words of mercy and didst still the raging waves, so now deign to hear our trustful prayer, and give back to the world peace and tranquillity.

And do thou, O most holy Virgin, as in other times of sore distress, be now our help, our protection, and our safeguard. Amen.

**GRACES AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED BY POPE BENEDICT XV
TO THE PRIESTS WHO ATTENDED THE CARDINALS DURING
THE CONCLAVE THAT ELECTED HIM TO THE PAPACY**

(October 16, 1914)

[The English-speaking conclavists, including those who attended Cardinals Gibbons, O'Connell, and Bégin (who all three arrived after the election of the Pope), are granted the privilege of a private oratory.]

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV

MOTU PROPRIO

GRATIAE ET PRIVILEGIA CLERICIS CONCLAVISTIS POSTREMI CONCLAVIS
CONCESSA

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Vixdum, secreto Dei consilio, ad beati Petri Cathedram evecti eramus, cum subiit cogitatio animum, quo pacto possemus iis gratificari ecclesiasticis viris, qui in postremo Conclavi vel Nobis et venerabilibus Fratribus Nostris S. R. E. Cardinalibus uti familiares adfuerunt vel commisso sibi peculiari munere sunt sollerter studioseque perfuncti; qua in re cupiebamus non modo decessorum Nostrorum vestigia persequi, sed etiam aliquod edere testimonium caritatis Nostrae erga dilectos filios, qui ea de causa labores vel incommoda sustinuissent. Placuit igitur clericos Conclavistas nonnullis augere gratiis ac privilegiis, quae essent iis non modice profutura. Itaque auctoritate Nostra ac Motu proprio decernimus quae sequuntur:

I. Clerici Conclavistae, qui secuti sunt S. R. E. Cardinales in Urbe degentes aut dioecesis Italiae regendis praepositos, gratias, provisiones aut commendas quorumvis beneficiorum, si quae forte sibi conferantur, itemque Litteras Apostolicas de iis conficiendas, gratuito, at semel tantum, habeant.

II. Clericis Conclavistis S. R. E. Cardinalium, qui dioeceses extra Italiam moderantur, oratorii privati ius esto, ea tamen lege, ut Ordinarius oratorium ante visitaverit ac probarit. Quo ipso iure, eadem condicione servata, ceteris Conclavistis tum frui liceat, cum infirma sunt valetudine.

III. Idem esto privilegium iis qui comitati sunt S. R. E. Presbyteros Cardinales Iacobum Gibbons Archiepiscopum Baltimoremensem, Gulielmum O'Connell Archiepiscopum Bostoniensem et Ludovicum Nazarium Bégin Archiepiscopum Quebecensem, quamvis hi post electionem Nostram advenerint; modo tamen iis ne desint cetera quae in Conclavistis requiruntur.

IV. Gratis prorsus dentur Apostolicae de his privilegiis ac iuribus Litterae.

V. Quoniam vero clericis Conclavistis, qui adfuerunt S. R. E. Cardinalibus in Urbe commorantibus aut dioeceses Italiae regen-

tibus, pro Apostolicae Sedis tenuitate non licet Nobis, quod decedentes Nostri consueverunt, perpetuas constituere pensiones, iisdem, ut in hoc etiam genere aliqua voluntatis Nostrae significatio ne desit, trecentas libellas singulis, semel tantum, attribuimus.

Non obstantibus Constitutionibus, Ordinationibus, Nostris ac Cancellariae Apostolicae Regulis, aliisque licet speciali et individua mentione dignis; quibus omnibus et singulis, etiamsi de illis specialis et individua habenda mentio, eorumque tenores inserendi forent, illis alias in suo robore permansuris, hac vice dumtaxat specialiter et expresse Motu proprio derogamus, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque, cum clausulis opportunitis.

Fiat motu proprio J.

Et cum absolutione a censuris ad effectum etc. Et cum declaratione quod reliqua privilegia et indulta contenta in similibus Motus proprii schedulis a nonnullis Romanis Pontificibus praedecessoribus Nostris favore Conclavistarum alias editis, ob hodiernas rerum ac temporum circumstantias pro nunc in suspensio remaneant. Et quod praesentis Nostri Motus proprii schedulae signatura sufficiat et ubique fidem faciat in iudicio et extra illud, Regula quaecumque contraria non obstante; et quod praemissorum omnium et singulorum maior et verior specificatio et expressio fieri possit in Litteris, si videbitur, expediendis, in quibus singulorum Conclavistarum nomina et cognomina exprimi et describi, seu pro expressis et descriptis haberi possint, inter quos Sacrista et Magistri Caeremoniarum Capellae Nostrae, nec non Secretarius Collegii eorundem Cardinalium. Volumus autem quod Litterarum super praesentibus conficiendarum ac etiam praesentis Nostri Motus proprii transumptis impressis ac manu alicuius personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae subscriptis et sigillo munitis, eadem fides, tam in iudicio quam extra illud adhibeatur, quae originalibus Litteris vel praesenti Motui proprio originali adhiberetur, si forent exhibitae vel ostensae, aut exhibitus vel ostensus foret.—*Fiat J.*

Datum Romae, apud sanctum Petrum die xvi mensis octobris anno mdccccxiv, Pontificatus Nostri primo.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*

In the Index Conclavistarum which follows the *Motu Proprio* are mentioned as assisting at the Conclave :

PATRITIUS LYONS Presbyter; MICHAELIS, Card. Tit. S. Mariae de Pace, LOGUE.

THOMAS CARROL Presbyter; JOANNIS MARIAE, Card. Tit. S. Mariae supra Minervam, FARLEY.

ARTHURUS PHILIPPUS JACKMAN Presbyter; FRANCISCI, Card. Tit. S. Pudentianae, BOURNE.

THE POWER OF BLESSING MEDAL-SCAPULARS FOR THE USE OF
SOLDIERS IS GRANTED TO EVERY PRIEST DURING THE
PRESENT WAR

(November 10, 1914)

SACRA CONGREGATIO PRO NEGOTIIS ECCLESIASTICIS EXTRAORDINARIIS
UNICUIQUE SACERDOTI CONCEDITUR FACULTAS, PRAESENTI BELLO
DURANTE, IN MILITUM UTILITATEM, SINGULIS SCAPULARIUM
BENEDICTIONIBUS NUMISMATA DITANDI

Ex audientia Ssmi, die 10 novembris 1914

Pius f. r. Papa X, annuens precibus quas Eidem obtulerat R. P. Norbertus Monjaux, O.F.M., rector Instituti sacris scapularibus inter milites propagandis, rescripto, die 22 martii anno 1912 a Secretaria Status dato, benigne concessit ut omnes milites ex copiis terrestribus et maritimis, sub armis constituti, pro lubitu possent legitime, quovis tempore, sacris scapularibus adscribi eisque definitive adscripti permanere atque adnexas indulgentias et gratias lucrari, ea tantum conditione, ut metallicum numisma, supremae S. Congregationis S. Officii decreto diei 16 decembris 1910 praescriptum riteque benedictum, deferrent, nec tamen prius scapularia ex panno, uti par est, recipiendi lege tenerentur.

Cum autem ab eodem pii Operis rectore S. Sedi nunc nuntiatum sit ingentem sane militum numerum quam plurimi facere spirituale numismatis illius gestandi beneficium, idque vehementer optare, nec ipsis pro rei necessitate praesto esse sacerdotes qui facultatibus singulas scapularium benedictiones numismati attribuendi polleant, Ssmus Dominus noster Benedictus divina providentia Papa XV, referente me infrascripto sacrae Congregationis Negotiis Ecclesiasticis Extraordinariis praepositae Secretario, ad eosdem milites in optimo proposito confirmandos, ad ferventiores in iis excitandos pietatis sensus, atque etiam ad favores omne genus sacratissimi Cordis Iesu et beatissimae Virginis ipsis hoc miserrimo tempore conciliandos, benigne indulgere dignatus est ut omnes sacerdotes ex utroque clero, licet nondum ad confessiones adprobat, in utilitatem militum cuiusvis gradus, qui e nationibus sint bellum gerentibus, usque dum hoc idem bellum ardeat, singulis scapularium benedictionibus ditandi praescripta a S. Officio numismata plenam habeant facultatem, eaque libere omnino uti possint ac valeant.

Contrariis quibuslibet, iis nominatim quae statuta sunt in Motu Proprio diei 7 aprilis anno 1910, minime obfuturis.

Datum Romae, e Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis, die, mense et anno praedictis.

EUGENIUS PACELLI, *Secretarius.*

DECLARATION IN REFERENCE TO THE DECREE OF THE
SACRED CONSISTORIAL CONGREGATION CONCERNING
PRIESTS WHO EMIGRATE TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES

(November 24, 1914)

[It is asked whether certain words used in the Decree of March 25, 1914 (vide I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, Vol. ii. p. 655), have the force of a precept, and the answer is in the affirmative.]

S. CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

DECLARATIO

CIRCA DECRETUM SACRAE CONGREGATIONIS CONSISTORIALIS DE
SACERDOTIBUS IN CERTAS QUASDAM REGIONES DEMIGRANTIBUS
DIEI 25 MARTII 1914

Quaerentibus nonnullis Ordinariis, utrum vim praecepti habeant verba enunciati decreti, art. 4, commate altero: 'qui (Episcopi) rem *deferant* ad hanc sacram Congregationem,' eadem sacra Congregatio respondere censuit affirmative, ita ut verbum *deferant* aequivaleat verbis *deferre debent*.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, die 22 novembris 1914.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, Episcopus Sabinensis, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

Sac. P. PISANI, *Substitutus pro Emigr.*

DECLARATION REGARDING THE RECITATION OF A CERTAIN
PRAYER FOR THE CONVERSION OF AFRICA

(July 23, 1914)

SUPREMA S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECLARATIO SEU INDULTUM

CIRCA RECITATIONEM CUIUSDAM ORATIONIS PRO AFRICAE
CONVERSIONE

Die 23 iulii 1914

Ssm̃us D. N. D. Pius div. prov. Pp. X, in audientia R. P. D. Adessori S. Officii impertita, benigne concedere dignatus est, ut in recitandis percibus pro Africae conversione, quae in authentica Sylloge Indulgentiarum, a S. Congr. Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita die 23 iulii 1898 adprobata, sub n. 340 reperiuntur, omitti possit invitatio seu introductio ad orationem proprie dictam, quin spirituales adnexi favores depereant.

Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

De mandato D. Card. Secretarii

L. ✠ S.

✠ DONATUS, Archiep. Ephesinus, *Adessor S.O.*

REVIEWS AND NOTES

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS. With Introductions and Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By Rev. Joseph MacRory, D.D., Vice-President and Professor of Sacred Scripture, Maynooth College. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

THE extent and, one may say, confusing variety of works on the New Testament make it impossible for the practical, everyday worker to sift them and discover in what they agree and in what they differ. In this work, by the learned Vice-President of Maynooth College, this sifting process has been admirably carried out, and the reader will find in the critical and explanatory commentary, which accompanies the text of St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, a safe guide to what is the common and accepted teaching, amongst the great Catholic authorities on the New Testament, as to the difficulties, frequent enough, in the writings of St. Paul. There is a simplicity in Dr. MacRory's treatment of his subject which will make the path of the learner easy—a simplicity due, not to the shirking of difficulties, but to the fact that the writer is discussing a subject of which he is a master and which he has made his own. Perhaps a specimen from the commentary provided for readers of this work will do more than any words of ours to bring home its clearness and thoroughness. On the text : 'Have we not power to carry about a woman a sister, as well as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas ?' (1 Cor. ix. 5), Dr. MacRory writes as follows :—

'Have we not power to bring about a woman a sister,' etc. The R.V. translates 'a wife that is a believer.' Now, whatever be the meaning of the words, this translation is bad, for it is undeniable that the Greek word *γυνή* is ambiguous, and may mean either woman (without reference to whether she is married or single) or wife. This being so, it is wrong in a translation to determine the word to one meaning, and especially when that meaning has both tradition and the context against it. Now, the Fathers commonly, both Greek—Clem. Alex., Theod., Theoph., Oec.; and Latin—Tert., Jer., Aug., Pel., Prim., Ambter., understand the Apostle to speak of the right of bringing about with him a woman who would support him from her means. Such women, we know from the Gospels (Matt. xxvii. 55 ; L. viii. 1, ff.), accompanied our Lord Himself, and it was quite a usual thing, and a matter neither for scandal nor surprise, for Jewish teachers to be accompanied by such. 'As faithful women followed the Lord, providing the disciples with the sustenance

they required, so some of the Apostles were attended by women of fervent faith, who hung upon their teaching and helped the work of the Gospel' (Theod.). And St. Jerome on Matt. xxvii. 55 says: 'Consuetudinis enim Judaicae fuit nec ducebatur in culpam more gentis antiquo ut mulieres de substantia sua victum atque vestitum praeceptoribus ministrarent.'

And St. Augustine (De mon. op. iv. 5), having explained the present passage in the same way, adds: 'Hoc quidam non intelligentes non *sororem mulierem* sed *uxorem* interpretati sunt. Fefellit eos verbi graeci ambiguitas, quod et *uxor* et *mulier* eodem verbo graece dicitur. Quamquam hoc ita posuerit Apostolus, ut falli non debuerint: quia neque *mulierem* tantummodo ait, sed *sororem mulierem*, neque *ducendi* sed *circumducendi*.' Tradition is, therefore, absolutely against understanding the passage of a wife.

And the context is equally opposed to such a view. For the argument of the Apostle is, that while he might have claimed support from the churches or brought about with him a Christian lady of means who would contribute towards his maintenance, and thus be saved from the necessity of working (v. 6), he had foregone these rights (v. 15) in order not to place any possible obstacle to the spread of the Gospel. It is wholly improbable, then, that the Apostle speaks of a wife, and this appears still more clearly from the fact that there is no evidence to prove that the other Apostles brought wives about with them. Nay, St. Peter's confident declaration: 'Behold, we have left *all things*, and have followed Thee,' especially when we take it in conjunction with our Lord's reply: 'Amen, I say to you, there is no man that hath left house or parents or brethren *or wife*¹ or children for the kingdom of God's sake,' etc., implies that the Apostles did not bring wives around with them.

The words, then, mean: Have we not power to bring about a Christian woman to minister to us from her means? This being once admitted, it matters little whether we take ἀδελφὴν (γυναῖκα) to mean: 'a woman as a sister' or 'a Christian woman.'

To each chapter Dr. MacRory prefixes a brief outline or argument, and where occasion demands a special introduction, so that the student is in possession of a full and trustworthy work on the Epistles. Apart from the fact that the commentaries in English on the Epistles are few, the present one justifies its existence by its intrinsic merits, and more than maintains the reputation which its learned author has already gained in the field of Scriptural exegesis. To many a hard-worked priest, both in Ireland and in foreign lands, it will recall the teaching of his former master, and to all it will bear evidence that Maynooth, in the person of its learned Vice-President, keeps its fitting rank in the department of Scriptural studies. To many of our readers, whose *Alma Mater* is Maynooth, it must be a real source of pride to find, from the reviews of the many works issuing from Maynooth, which we have lately published, striking evidence of its well-sustained intellectual life.

THE EDITOR.

¹ 'The words "or wife" are admitted by Protestant critics to be genuine in Luke xviii. 29, though rejected by them in the parallel passages of SS. Matt. and Mark.'—(Author's Note.)

THE PHILOSOPHY OF FAITH. By Bertram Brewster. Pp. 200.
London : Longmans.

THIS volume discusses, in brief compass, all the fundamental problems of religion and morality. In addition to an Introduction it contains chapters on Truth, Virtue, Freedom, Optimism, Beauty, and the Highest Good. While working out many lines of thought in an interesting and readable manner, the whole effect is unsatisfactory. To the firm believer in the fullness of Christian Revelation the aids it offers are superfluous, while to the weak believer or the unbeliever they are, we fear, useless and unconvincing—mainly, we would say, because of its halting and compromising attitude. While not making clear what he means by 'Faith,' the main drift of the author is to emphasize emotional and voluntarist grounds of 'belief' in human freedom, virtue, immortality, etc., in defiance of unsolved intellectual difficulties.

'Ordinary knowledge for ordinary people, is, of course, something indubitable, though they can give no clear account of it. But this indubitableness unfortunately has a tendency to melt away and disappear as soon as it is closely investigated. Bias being excluded, it diminishes in proportion to the development of the critical faculty: reason, when employed critically, being like a candle, which consumes its own wax.' This passage (pp. 23-4) suggests the author's attitude towards intellectual grounds of belief. Reason he appears to regard as a universal solvent, holding that inquiry into the grounds and validity of the principles and postulates of all knowledge, 'in so far as it is really dispassionate and intelligent, not only does actually, but always must, tend to scepticism' (p. 35)—which outcome, he adds (p. 39), 'is mainly a matter of temperament.' After this we could not expect to find principles or problems handled with anything like a vigorous or robust intellectual grasp—nor did we. Not but that the author displays abundant evidence of having bestowed deep and candid and sincere thought on the matters treated. But the results are unconvincing. 'Science' gets credit for perhaps more than its due; the impression is left that its findings are somehow out of joint with the content of what religion prompts us to 'believe'; virtue is put on a sort of altruistic utilitarian basis; the chapter on freedom, while opening well and containing a few excellent pages (pp. 90 sqq.) devoted to the demolition of materialistic difficulties, develops in a most confusing fashion into an attempt to reconcile freedom with determinism—at which we were not surprised when we read this confession of phenomenism: 'The self which interests us, in whose good or ill fortune we are so nearly concerned, whose good character and excellence of nature is an object of our

so great solicitude, is *the congeries of thoughts and feelings which make up our consciousness*, with the powers and potentialities belonging to it' (italics ours). Where Christian faith has decayed, so has man's belief in the eternity of punishments. If 'belief' be based on the individualistic factors of sentiment, emotion, feeling, etc., naturally the wish will often be father to the belief: 'That (God) will condemn any creature eternally is what faith cannot admit for a moment,' the author tells us (p. 116). From which it is obvious that faith, whatever it may mean, is not taken as belief in revealed truth on the authority of God revealing. Throughout we find a regrettable anxiety to attribute undue importance to passing, popular phases of 'scientific,' 'philosophical' and 'religious' thought. The reader is referred to the phenomena of spiritism, to such writers as Myers, Hon. G. W. Balfour, and Sir Oliver Lodge; while the traditional historical Christianity is scarcely alluded to—except as a played-out anachronism.

The events of the terrible times through which we are passing furnish a sad commentary on some of the author's views and statements regarding the progressive evolution of mankind, the beneficent achievements of science, etc. But no one, we think, will quarrel with this studiously modest presentment of the actual standard of current morality: 'In civilised communities men are already partially moralised: virtue is desired and cultivated to a certain extent by the majority, and every moderately good person will wish at least to retain that degree of useful disinterestedness which he has attained to, and probably even to improve upon it to some extent, if circumstances be not too hard for him.' If the European war has a 'moralising' effect on the remnant that survives, such moral amelioration will, of course, be set down to the credit of 'Evolution.'

P. C.

THE CATHOLIC STUDENT'S 'AIDS' TO THE BIBLE. By Hugh Pope, O.P., S.T.M., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Collegio Angelico, Rome. London: R. & T. Washbourne. 1913.

THIS work is intended to supply the Catholic student with a summary of such information as one might expect to find in the General and Special Introduction to the Old Testament. It seems also to be meant to serve as a substitute, in some way, of the Bible Dictionary. Together with the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* it contains the various decisions of the Biblical Commission relating to the books of the Old Testament. Over fifty pages of the book are given to the text of these different official documents. Thus the reader is put in a position to study for himself directly the

recognised Catholic teaching on many of the most important points of Sacred Scripture.

The chapter on the versions of the Old Testament is very good. The account of the Vulgate in this chapter is unusually full and interesting. Dr. Pope's treatment of Inspiration is clear, as far as it goes. The author is at pains to distinguish clearly between Inspiration and Revelation (p. 41). The thinking student will, however, scarcely feel satisfied when he is told merely that the human author is under Inspiration, the 'instrument of the Holy Spirit.' That explains, indeed, why Inspiration is not dictation (p. 46), but it still leaves obscure for the general reader in what sense precisely Inspiration 'has in it a human element as well as a divine' (p. 41). On page 2 the author says: 'Since the Bible is divine there can be no error in it.' How is this to be reconciled with the human quality of the instrument? And if there are no errors anywhere in any way in the Bible text, what of the chronology of Judges which Dr. Pope rejects (p. 220), or of the 'patent contradictions' which he admits in Kings (p. 235), or of the difficulties which he points out in Chronicles (p. 253)? What are we to think, further, of Tobias, of which, according to Dr. Pope, the author was a Jew 'who wrote at a time when the details of Assyrian history and geography were not known and gives names and places according to the opinion of the time' (p. 261)? What, again, of the obvious difficulties of Judith and Esther which the author refers to (pp. 264, 268)? Dr. Pope does not anywhere set out a simple and generally intelligible theory to explain how the existence of apparent errors in the biblical text is consistent with the teaching that that text contains no errors whatever.

The account of Creation in Genesis is described as 'a portion of what we may term the world's heritage' (p. 195). We are to regard the Hebrew story of Creation, however, as 'a true account . . . preserved undiluted and handed down from century to century' (p. 198). The Genesis narrative is not a 'purification' of the Chaldean account of the Creation (*ibid.*). We are not told, however, how the primitive story of Creation first arose. Was it revealed? It must have come into being sometime, and yet no man witnessed Creation. Dr. Pope seems to lay but slight stress on the various hypotheses suggested to explain away the exegetic difficulties of Genesis i. (p. 198 f).

There are many excellent points in the author's treatment of the other four books of Moses. He has instructive remarks on the 'Law of Holiness' (p. 206). He admits the presence of different documents and a progressive legislation in Numbers (p. 208). For

the traditional ancient date of Deuteronomy he suggests useful arguments (p. 215) not often referred to by Catholic writers.

The early historical books—Joshua, Judges, and Kings—are dealt with suggestively. The chronology of these books comes in, very properly, for special treatment. The contrasts of biblical with extra-biblical oriental chronology are noted—but not closely examined (p. 235). A set of chronological tables extending from the rise of the Hebrew monarchy to the Greek period supplies a very useful, though not incontrovertible, basis for the historical study of the Old Testament.

The treatment of the prophetic books is brief and not very new. The integrity of Isaias is maintained, and a vigorous defence of the mainly prophetic mission of the Prophets is set up (pp. 331 ff).

In connexion with the titles of the Psalms Dr. Pope speaks of Corahite and Davidic Collections (p. 294), and it is not quite clear whether he would consider that any title gives evidence of direct Davidic authorship. He holds, however, that there is 'absolutely no ground for questioning the Davidic authorship' of the first book of Psalms (p. 296), and seems inclined to hold that every psalm assigned to David—even in Books iv and v—whether on the basis of such ascription or not is obscure, must be regarded as a Davidic composition.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Pope emphatically puts the prophets Jonas, Abdias, and Joel in the period 800-700 B.C. (p. 323). It is well to have this traditional view re-affirmed.

In a book like the one before us slight mistakes and omissions are almost inevitable. The Psalms are not *Tehilim*, but *Tehillim* (or *Tillim*) (p. 279). Among the most ancient Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament ought to have been mentioned the fragmentary pre-Masoretic text of the Papyrus Nash. Dr. Pope seems to accept without criticism the Egyptian chronology of Petrie and his school. It is to be regretted that Dr. Pope did not find it possible to help his readers by giving them some kind of bibliography.

Dr. Pope's little work is eminently timely. It is certain to do good service, and we recommend it warmly both to the student and to the general reader.

P. B.

WITHIN THE SOUL: HELPS IN THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By Rev. Michael F. Watson, S.J. London: Washbourne, Ltd.

THIS book of little essays on various aspects of the spiritual life is a very useful publication and very practical. Many of the subjects treated of are such as affect our everyday lives, and there is hardly a page in the little book that will not be found to contain

some interesting and profitable thoughts for the Catholic reader. The earlier editions were confined to Australia, and it is eloquent testimony to its value as a spiritual book that a fourth edition has been called for.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (January).
The Ecclesiastical Review (January). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (January). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (January). New York.
The Austral Light (December). Melbourne.
The Ave Maria (December). Notre Dame, Indiana.
The Irish Monthly (January). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Catholic Bulletin (January). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (January). London : Longmans.
Our Boys (January). Edited by Christian Brothers, Dublin.
Studies, Vol. III, No. 12 (December). Dublin : The Educational Co., Ltd.
Missionary Record of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate (Nov., Dec., Jan.). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Annals of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart (January). Cork : Guy.
The Dublin Review (January). London : Burns and Oates.
The African Missionary (January-February). Blackrock, Cork.
The Life of St. Fechin of Fore. By Rev. John Boyle, C.S.S.R. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
What of To-Day? By Father Bernard Vaughan. London : Cassell.
The Ivy Hedge. By Maurice Francis Egan. New York : Benziger.
The Golden Legend. By Rev. G. V. O'Neill, S.J., M.A. Cambridge : University Press.
The Solitaries of the Sambuca. By Daniel Mauldsley. London : Burns and Oates.
Anti-Christian Socialism. By Rev. C. L. Drawbridge. London : Longmans.
Rambles in Catholic Lands. By Rev. Michael Barrett, O.S.B. New York : Benziger.
Popular Sermons on the Catechism. By Rev. A. H. Bamberg. London : Washbourne.
The Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Fully Explained and Annotated. London : Washbourne.
Round About Home. By Rev. P. J. Carroll, C.S.C. Notre Dame, Indiana : The Ave Maria.
How to Help the Dead. By Mary H. Allies. London : Burns & Oates.
Bond and Free. By Jean Connor. New York : Benziger.
Catholic Truth Society (London) Publications : *Eenvoudig Gebedenboek* (Flemish Prayer-book); *A Book of the Eucharist*; *The Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament*; *The God of Philosophy*, by Rev. Francis Aveling, Ph.D., D.Sc., D.D.; *The Principles of Christianity*, by Rev. A. B. Sharpe, M.A.; *The Church in Scotland*, by Rev. H. G. Graham, M.A.; *The Church in South Africa*, by Hon. A. Wilmot, K.S.G., K.H.S.; *Book, Bell, and Candle*, by Rev. H. Thurston, S.J.
The Irish Messenger Series (5 Great Denmark Street, Dublin) : *The Apostleship of Prayer in Schools*, by a Teacher; *Saints and Shrines of Lough Corrib*, by Rev. Francis M. Browne, S.J.; *The Church and Anti-Clericalism*, by Rev. Peter Finlay, S.J.; *Drink Handbook*; *A True Boy*, by Rev. Martin Corbett, S.J.; *Our Lady of Dolours*, by Rev. Joseph M'Donnell, S.J.; *Frequent and Daily Communion*, by Rev. Joseph M'Donnell, S.J.; *Daily Mass*, by Rev. Joseph M'Donnell, S.J.; *Rogers of Seaforth*, by Rev. Martin Corbett, S.J.

RELIGIOUS REVIVAL IN FRANCE

BY VERY REV. A. WALSH, O.S.A.

THE moment of strain and stress reveals the essential character of a man far better than the piping times of peace, when he is cheated by health and vigour into the belief that he is far other than he really is. When things go well and the winds favour our course it is a human foible to think that we alone are guiding the ship. At such times we are inclined to do what Henley did in his impious poem :

Thank whatever gods there be
For my unconquerable soul.

But when things go wrong, we turn to better thoughts. When the sails are in shreds and the vessel no longer answers our hand, we begin to perceive new cogency in the teaching that takes the correct measure of our little selves. We then easily turn to that Higher Power in whose hands lies all human destiny.

In such moments a man will rest upon the only support within reach. Like Lincoln, in the terrible crises of American history, he will go on his knees, because there is nowhere else to go. Such moments are foci of lights which reveal the whole inwardness of a man's creed. When darkness falls on him, and he finds himself alone with the night that covers him, we can see the true nature of his creed and the true measure of the comfort and strength it brings to his rescue. He will stretch out his impotent hands to the unseen object of his belief, and his unique trust will lie in the pity and mercy of the Powers whose very existence was forgotten when the world went well with him and he was content with what it gave. The

Latin poet gives us the picture of the pagan caught in the storm when the stars were hidden and the moon lost in the gloom. He pictures him as turning to his gods for safety and rest :—

Otium divos rogat impotenti
Prensus Aegeo, simul altra nubes
Condidit lunam neque certa fulgent
Sidera nautis.

The man who has not even a pagan's faith in ' whatever gods there be,' still believes in himself alone. This attitude we believe to be the theory of men who write of the tragedy of things after a good dinner. It is not an authentic human document; it is the militant egoist's plea for his impious folly and pride. It finds full and adequate expression in Henley's horrible verses :—

In the fell clutch of circumstance
I have not winced or cried aloud.
Under the bludgeonings of chance
My head is bloody, but unbow'd.

Beyond this place of wrath and tears
Looms but the horror of the shade;
And yet the menace of the years
Finds and shall find me unafraid.

It matters not how strait the gate
How charged with punishment the scroll,
I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul.

In all this we find the fallacious arrogance of a man who was intoxicated with the strong wine of life. If death had been looming over him these inhuman words would never have been flung in the face of the God, the light of whose countenance falls in some degree upon every creature who has the gift of reason.

The European nations are now in the midst of circumstances which put such a strain upon millions of souls as scarcely finds a parallel in history. The horrors of war have become intensified in direct ratio to the scientific progress which has multiplied the agents of death just

as much as it has ministered to the use and enjoyment of life. The march of civilisation has added incalculably to the horrors and sufferings of the battlefield.

The carnage and terror of the present conflict beggars all that has hitherto been experienced in war. The floor of the earth has hitherto been the only possible theatre for human conflict, but now from the air above the struggling soldiers falls a new menace of death, and under the keels of the fighting ship lurk the terrors of the mine and the submarine. The soldier as he fights is encircled with unseen and most real engines of destruction, so that now, more than at any previous epoch, the man who puts on a uniform marches straight into the very jaws of death.

All the glamour of war is over. It is now simply the very trade of destruction, and men hold their lives by a very slender thread of hope, and must look upon death as something almost inevitable. The effect has been a confirmation of the consoling belief of all Christian peoples that there are blessings as well as terrors in the shadow of his wings. The peril of the trench and the charge brings with it healing thoughts. Men see how weak, how little they are, when no human prudence can help them. The lurid lights of the field reveal the hidden mysteries of conscience; faith in the unseen awakens as all trust in nature and man is lost; so much so that, under the pressure of these terrible facts, feelings and memories are brought into light that transform the hardened man into one who is again a child who has never known the wreck of a hope or the shadow of a doubt. There is no other source of consolation left to us at this moment, and that this return to God is a fact of the situation is beyond any reasonable doubt. The evidence in its favour comes from many sources and cannot be gainsaid. We have some interesting documents under our eyes which go to prove that to France, at least, the campaign has brought a new spirit among its soldiers. A new life has sprung up in the fighting ranks so little fostered and helped by human hands, so hampered, in fact, and hindered by every device

of law and administration, that we are justified in tracing it to its source in the providential favour of God.

Everyone knows the recent revival of persecution in the French Republic. The hospitals were laicised, the religious communities ruthlessly suppressed, the clergy deprived of their means of livelihood, the seminaries barred and bolted, the very churches abandoned by law to wreck and ruin. All the privileges of the ecclesiastical state were brutally outraged, and the priest reduced to the level of a private citizen. Nay, he had not the normal rights of an ordinary man; he was the butt of every knave and petty official, and this because of his sacred character. He was forced into the barracks as a conscript, and he was brought there in the hope that the routine of drill and the freedom of soldier life would kill in him the desire to devote himself to the service of God and souls. If there was no higher power, this policy should have had a full measure of success. The issue of it in fact is the presence of nearly 20,000 priests in the fighting line. They are first in military service, in courage, and discipline. They have won medals for bravery and daring deeds. But they have done better still. They have come to the battlefield with the priest-heart beating beneath their military tunic, *avidés* for souls, and ready for the ministry of life as much as for the horrible ritual of war.

We have some letters before us that give incontestable proofs of this double glory of the French clergy. These pages cannot be read without emotion by anyone who has at heart the interest of souls and the glory of the Church of Christ.

The first letter was written by a captain of Zouaves to a priest of the diocese of Nantes who had written to him for particulars of the death of a nephew who served in his company and was killed on September 16. The letter, as will be seen, is that of one who has no part in our beliefs, but it renders clear homage to the force of the religious sentiments of the French soldiers:—

Never [he writes], as in these sad times, have I regretted that I have no part in your religious beliefs. There is no doubt I should

draw from them a moral strength so often needed. You may take it, however, that I respect them more than ever, and that I accept with grateful thoughts the sentiments you have written in your letter. I shall always entertain a particular veneration for those priests who have so magnificently done their duty as Frenchmen in this terrible war, and for the courage they have inspired among their fellow-Catholics.

This answers the taunt of their enemies, that the priests lose their manhood and their patriotism because of their sacred office. The second letter is from a priest of the diocese of Toulouse who is in the ambulance service :—

I am still in the automobile ambulance service. Our duty is to seek out the wounded and carry them to the stations or hospitals in the rear. We have seen nearly all the battle fronts. The resignation and courage of the wounded is really admirable. What really consoles me is that I have had to exercise my office as priest *once only*, in the case of a poor fellow who was dying in a wagon close to me. I say *it is consoling* because the wounded, all, or nearly all, have found a priest either among the ambulance men or even among their comrades in the fighting line. In every ambulance, in all the hospitals, in all the hospital trains, there are priests, either chaplains or soldiers.

This letter shows two things: the success of the Catholic priesthood, and the absolute defeat of the sectarian tactics which would destroy the priest by making him a soldier. Here we see them, by their very position as military men, penetrating into the intimate confidences of their fellow-soldiers and bringing them life in the midst of death.

The *Semaine Religieuse* of Nantes gives the full text of the following letter. It loses none of its force from the fact that the name of the writer is not given. It comes straight from the heart of a Catholic father, and cannot be read with dry eyes by anyone who admires patriotism and religious conviction :—

Yes, we should be proud to give to France all we hold dearest, but above all we should find an immense peace in the thought that he whom we loved best has found a happiness that shall never end. I am confident that James has entered into a happy eternity. He had, from the moment of his departure, made the sacrifice of his

life into the hands of God. His suffering was terrible to see, but his sincerity was absolute.

The accounts given by his comrades affirm that he renewed this sacrifice many times, notwithstanding the terrible pain caused by the souvenirs of his wife and three little ones. He died in the heroic accomplishment of his duty. Having received the order to attack a village, his entire company was exposed to a hurricane of fire from a neighbouring wood. He shouted to his men, 'Lie down,' and that moment a ball struck his temple. He staggered, then recovered himself, tied his handkerchief, at once covered with blood, around his head, and at that instant, having taken the distance, he gave the command: 'Fire as you please, at 600 metres,' and fell a corpse. A priest, who was one of his sergeants, gave him a last absolution, and took over some little souvenir, now in our possession. I am confident he has saved his soul, but fancy our sorrow.

This picture is worth keeping as a souvenir of the war and as an evidence of the spirit with which France is fighting. The officer falls, his sergeant gives him absolution; for the sergeant is a priest as well as a soldier, and can fight death in all its phases.

Although I draw these letters as if by hazard from a packet arranged by another hand, I could not do better to secure a contrast between those I like than by following the suite made by another hand. The following deals with the grandson of Ernest Renan, the leader of revolt against Christian evidences in the France of the last troubled century. The grace rejected by the ex-Sulpician seminarist came to his descendant, and bore its fruit in good time. The story of his death as a Christian soldier is told by le Père Janvier, the celebrated preacher of Notre Dame, in a letter to the *Croix*:—

I shall be grateful if you recommend in a special manner to the prayers of our Catholic people Lieutenant Ernest Pschari, of the Colonial Artillery, Dominican Tertiary of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. Godson and grandson of Renan, this young man gave evidence of an ardent and admirably generous soul.

Converted by a Dominican from Lyons, and directed by the same distinguished Father, he aspired to the entire sacrifice of himself, and was on fire to offer his life as a holocaust to Christ. Notwithstanding the many occupations of his *métier* he recited his

Breviary every day, and the superabundance of his interior life had already been poured out upon his generation. When the war was declared he had thought of breaking entirely with the world by entering religious life. God has chosen to crown before his time this young and valiant servant.

This letter is for me one of special interest. It fills me with surprise that Renan should have held his little grandson as the waters of baptism were poured on him. Whether the great enemy of Christ discharged the duties of his office we do not know. But the child lived to renounce the world that so held the heart of his grandfather. He had inherited some of the literary talent of his family and published a book that was crowned by the French Academy. He was killed, August 22, near Virton in Belgium—*mort au champ d'honneur*. Had he lived he might have helped by his life and his genius to undo some of the evil work effected by his ancestor. But war came and hastened his victory. One thinks, in reading of his early crown, of the passage of St. Augustine, where he speaks of the Holy Innocents: 'Quos in medio frigore infidelitatis exortos quaedam pruina persecutionis decoxit.' Born, as he was, in the heart of an unbelieving epoch, he was destined for a crown which came earlier through the action of the cruel war that now matures the flower of European youth for the merciful judgments of God.

The next letter I draw from my budget is so picturesque and so like what we should expect from the nature of the case that I cannot refrain from giving it entire. It is not easy to catch all the flavour of the phrase, as some of the ingredients are of a *patois* that is beyond turning into another language. But its realism is such that any version must make good reading.

Extract from a letter of a military chaplain :—

In one of our trenches a priest-sergeant (he is a professor in the Seminary of Montauban) was squatting with his section. From a trench near hand a little soldier, who has not the luck to have a priest with him, comes out, and, crawling like a worm, makes headway towards his neighbour. He gets on without being hit by the fire, and is, at length, at the opening of the underground

lodging of his reverence, the sergeant. Once there, *à plat ventre*, with his nose in the ground, he calls in a whisper: 'Salvan, es-tu là—Are you there, Salvan?'

'Yes,' said the priest-sergeant. 'What do you want? Do you wish to come in? Are you mad? If the Germans see you, you're done for.'

'Don't talk so much. Say, could you hear my confession?'

'Yes, at once.'

'All right; but I cannot go on my knees, they would knock over my skittles (on me déquillerait).'

'It is not necessary; stay as you are.'

And, right there, leaning over his trench, where the priest-sergeant stood, the little soldier received God's pardon, and then made off, crawling slowly, slowly, until he reached his post.

This story is absolutely authentic. I had it from the lips of the Abbé Salvan himself.

I do not know of a more vivid picture of the France of this moment than this letter gives us. When the history of our times is being written such a trait deserves to be enshrined in it. The figure of the little soldier creeping across the line of fire to find a *sergeant* for his confession might well inspire an artist of the future to tell in his fine way the marvels of religious revival in this hour of ruin and death.

My next letter brings us on the very field of battle, and shows the army of France preparing for the grim work of fighting by making their confession with one voice to the man who carried their colours! It is from the priest who played the active part in this dramatic setting of the Sacrament of Penance:—

A few moments since [he writes] before leaving for the battlefield I had occasion to feel the most intense joy and emotion I have ever known. Leaning my left hand on my colours I forgot for a moment I was a soldier. I gave general absolution to the men, section by section. All these brave fellows were moved to tears. I made them a short address, and the tears were in my own eyes the while and my voice was broken with emotion. Then all of them, on bended knees, recited the Act of Contrition. Never, beyond any doubt, had they received the grace of sorrow so abundantly. Then, with all the fervour of which I was capable, I lifted up my hand for the absolution. Every head was bent, even of

those who in less critical circumstances were wont to sneer and blaspheme even. Then they arose, purified, happy, and braver than ever to face the fray.

This letter speaks for itself. We cannot but pay a tribute of respect and admiration to the young priest who, in the hour of battle with the flag of his country in his guarding hands, could rise to the heights of priestly enthusiasm, and so finely discharged the sacred duties of his higher ministry. The picture of this fine scene might well engage the brush of a master. But we can hang it in our hearts as it is painted in this simple letter.

The other letters I hold multiply the evidences of an intense religious revival in the ranks of the French troops. The points wherein they agree with those already put in evidence add nothing to the proofs adduced; but here and there I find in them features which go to confirm my point and indicate that the religious movement is in progress everywhere throughout the Republic and in all ranks of the army. The following show us the inspiring scene, where an officer makes an address to his men. He said, writes the Very Rev. Father Mathieu, Superior of the Grand Seminaire of Bayonne, 'that his regiment was one in which the practice of religion was observed without any sense of human respect.' The letter goes on to say that this state of things is largely due to the presence of priests in the ranks. 'I know,' continues the Rev. writer, 'many soldiers who say their rosary in the trenches. The greater number carry their medals openly. One of my acquaintances who had not been practising his religion for twelve years opened his heart to Forage-sergeant Lacu (Vicar at Arzacq), and another who did not shine in matters of piety has been transformed by the circumstances into a sober, Christian man.' He closes this letter with a quasi-mathematical formula: 'Irreligion decreases in direct ratio with the proximity of the firing line.'

Another priest in the ambulance service writes:—

I have been able to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice every morning, assisted every evening at the Rosary devotions, and, hence, I can

witness to the Christian sentiments of our valiant soldiers of the South. The poor fellows no longer put the flag in their pockets, they profess their faith openly. They come to confession and Communion, not simply by being led on by others, but from a real sense of spiritual need, as if they were caught in the movement of the drama that is disclosed before their eyes, wherein they play the leading parts. They give me the impression that there is here question of fine souls (*des âmes d'élite*) formed under the influence of divine grace, chiselled, as it were, into silence by the gravity of the situation, and hence coming close to God.

It would not be easy to put the beneficent influence of the peril of war into more eloquent words. Once again let me say that the letter comes to me without the name or address of the writer. But the stamp of truth is in every word of it, the strong evidence of daily facts alone could give the strong fibre of word and thought that runs through this document. I consider this homage of a man whose life-work lay in spiritual concerns to the spiritual qualities of the soldiers about him in his hospital work as a trait that honours the French clergy and speaks loudly for the broad manliness they bring to this great work.

My next is a simple cry of gratitude and pride coming from the heart of the trenches. In the original one sees all the national gift for strong and picturesque writing. It is the work of a man of some culture, no doubt, such as one looks for from a citizen army, where all classes meet in the common service of their country. The picture it gives is nothing less than marvellous, and could hardly be found in a similar *milieu* in any other people. It is direct, as a soldier's letter should be; I wish I could secure in my version a tithe of the simple beauty of the text:—

I have had the fortune to find my lieutenant a priest of the Catholic Institute, l'Abbé B——, who often, when things looked bad, put us in good spirits. When there was a day of respite, he said Mass for us and gave us Holy Communion. You should see with what fervour we approach the Holy Table. The colonel was the first to give the example, quietly and without any show. They say, *Monsieur*, there is no faith left in France; but I should wish that you assisted at Mass in the open air or in some poor church ruined by the enemy's guns. You would then see what

crowds there are. You would feel the sense of the faith that animates these men, so recollected during the Holy Sacrifice, and you would have been comforted by the sight. Ah! assuredly, there are more Catholics in France than people think, and there, on the battlefield, they show themselves and know no fear. At the same time, it has a comic effect in one to go to confession to a sub-lieutenant, to one's corporal, or even to a simple ranker. Do you fancy that discipline suffers from this? Not at all. It grows stronger even, and the bonds that unite the different ranks grow firmer. We fight like lions, but, without the precious help from above, there is nothing achieved. And hence, we are all praying. Do you think such an army can fail to win? It cannot be so. Our return home is doubtless far off, but when it comes it promises a rich harvest for the faith. You will see how people are changed, and I believe that France will become worthy of her title, *la fille aînée de l'Église*. We, all of us, who have seen the change with our own eyes and who have suffered, we shall give ourselves to the work as best we can.

This points the moral of the actual situation, and gives hopes that the France of the coming time will be far other than the France we have known in recent years. Many of these valiant men who now feel the breath of the Holy Spirit reanimating their faith and their charity will return when the war is over to preach in their homes, in their factories and in their fields, the lessons they have learned in the distress and suffering of this terrible year. They will not be likely to co-operate in a political movement to lessen the hold of God on the Fatherland, whose children were heartened and strengthened by His hand to fight her battles and assure her victory.

My last extract is taken from the *Semaine Religieuse* of Cahors, and tells the moving history of the death of Monsieur l'Abbé Huftier, Vicar of Saint-Sauveur de Figeac. He was a graduate of the French Seminary, Rome, and had received his doctorate in philosophy *cum laude*. His story is a fine page of contemporary biography, hard to match in the series of brilliant feats which marked the close of a young life devoted to God and man:—

Marcel Huftier gave his life to the two most beautiful causes

that a man can choose for the devotions of his life : the Church and the Fatherland. He died for these.

On August 3, the morrow of the day the tocsin had called to arms, Lieutenant Huftier was at Cahors in his uniform. His papers convoked him within eight days, and he was told off for service at the military depot. He came early so as to ask for active service. This was granted. On the eve of his departure he said to a friend : ' I have done my best to prepare for death. You will pray for me, will you not ? Ask that I may do my duty.' He did *not* say, ' That I may come back,' that was for him a secondary matter, but ' that I may do my duty.' His friend added, ' Your duty as priest and soldier ? ' ' Yes,' he answered, ' my duty as priest and soldier.'

This programme l'Abbé Huftier has nobly carried out. By his sense of duty, his vitality, and his bravery he won over his men. Many of them wept on hearing of his death. His superiors seeing his courage and energy quickly knew in him an officer of the highest quality. On account of repeated acts of heroism he was twice cited in the Army Orders, and proposed for the Legion of Honour.

The priest was no less esteemed than the soldier. The General who had him under his eyes from the beginning of the war has said : ' More than once I have seen him in the midst of his men who were lying down to let the bullets pass over them. I have seen him on his knees preparing some poor fellow to die.' On the 9th September, at six in the evening, near Vitry-le-François, the company of Lieutenant Huftier having finished its work retreats under a hurricane of fire. In falling back he sees a wounded man before our line, a few metres from the enemy. He saw him signal to him, and in the face of the fire he answered the call and reached the poor fellow. He was dying, and the soldier-priest gave him absolution. Then, this duty done, he prepared to rejoin his men. He was struck dead. When he used to speak of the war he said he had offered his life for the salvation of France. His offering was accepted.

His colonel wrote : ' He was a true hero in the highest sense of the word.'

After living a month of war, having given proof that in him lay the hero-heart of the soldier, he died a martyr to the charity of the priest. Who would not desire such a destiny ? Happy the privileged souls to whom God accords it ! When one has climbed to the highest reaches of earth then it remains only for him to fly to the higher heights beyond.

I leave this theme on the heights where this valiant soldier-priest has led me. I can add nothing to this recital of heroic deeds ; when one reaches the level of such

a life and such a death one should need wings for any further movement upwards. I leave this argument which, for many reasons, has an intense interest for me personally to the quiet reading of my readers, many of whom look with rising hopes to the future of France. This little sheaf of extracts from soldiers' letters may serve to throw some little light upon a question that must necessarily escape adequate study during these strenuous days of suffering and sacrifice, and, yet, which means so much for the Church and for the world. A new France, saved by fire and devastation, might renew the face of the earth. It was said in the Middle Ages, *Gesta Dei per Francos*. Perhaps we may, in our own time, see it once more verified. It would be some tardy return for the numberless graces given to that wonderful people. For it was also said in bygone years that God loved the French : *Dieu qui aime les Francs*.

A. WALSH, O.S.A.

THE KINGSHIP OF CHRIST AND THE ESCHATOLOGICAL SERMON

BY REV. F. ROTA, S.J.

THE eschatological question is one of great interest in these latter days owing to the many modern attacks on the origin of Christianity. After the famous discussions on Millerianism one would have thought that the subject of the 'parousia' had been finally dropped, but, a few years ago, A. Loisy, availing himself of Dr. Schell's theory on the mind of Christ and the Messianism of J. Weiss, revived it, and Modernists now make it their strongest argument against the Church.

LOISY'S THEORY

Loisy tried to show that not only did Christ believe that the end of the world was approaching, but that He based all His teaching and His mission on this eschatological conception. The mission of Christ, we are told, is bound up in the words: 'Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.'¹ This was Christ's conception of His Messiahship, and as such it was announced by His precursor²—explicitly declared at the beginning of His public life³ and explained to His apostles when He sent them on their mission.⁴ Thus the Messianic kingdom is essentially eschatological, and it is to be found in the final dominion which God will exercise over all men, when He will reward the good and punish the wicked. According to Loisy, Christ believed that He would then receive the kingship of this eschatological kingdom; and, consequently, until

¹ Matt. iii. 2.

² Matt. iii. 3.

³ Matt. iv. 17.

⁴ Matt. x. 7.

this kingdom is realised He is Messiah in expectation only : but this time of expectation was to be but for a brief period, because He contemplated, and herein He was deceived, an impending end of the world. From this point of view Loisy explains the detachment from worldly treasures preached by Christ, the promises made to the sorrowful and to the persecuted in the Sermon on the Mount.¹ It is, therefore, evident, continues Loisy, that Christ never thought of founding a Church, for this idea would have been against His knowledge and foresight. It is to His disciples, disappointed in their expectation of His coming, that we owe the organised Church. This is, briefly, the Modernist theory, which is the basis of all Modernist errors from a theological standpoint. The Church, according to Modernists, is not a divine institution, but the result of an illusion in the mind of Christ, and the outcome of the experience of Christ's followers, who found it a necessity to group themselves together in one body, just as they have found it necessary at all times to express their religious experience in synthetical formulæ called dogmas. Although Modernists do not explain the formation and growth of Christianity in precisely the same way as the Rationalists and higher critics, yet all these schools are in agreement in deriving their theories from the 'principle of evolution.' Some of the Rationalists would make Christianity but one stage in the gradual development of the 'religious sense,' which, starting with a confused idea of divinity has gradually evolved itself, through fetishism, polytheism and monotheism, to Christianity, which, in its turn, is terminating in atheism.² Other Rationalists, such as Jacolliot, derive it from Brahmanism ; Havet, Harnack, and Sabatier from Hellenism ; Salvador from the Essenes, and Modernists from an illusion of Christ. 'Jesus annonçait le royaume, et c'est l'Église qui est venue.'³

¹ See *L'Évangile et l'Église*, chap. 11. and *Autour d'un petit livre*, p. 176.

² See Potin, *Religion laïque et universelle*.

³ *L'Évangile et l'Église*, 3rd ed., p. 155.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST IS NOT MERELY ESCHATOLOGICAL

It is hardly necessary to refute Loisy's romanticism. From the Gospels, considered as historical documents, we have clear proofs that Christ founded a visible kingdom, which is to last on earth for an indefinite period. Christ does not leave us in doubt as to the characteristics of His kingdom. It is already inaugurated;¹ it has to grow and expand through all countries;² even among the Gentiles;³ to it belong the just and the unjust;⁴ the rich and the poor.⁵ All these characteristics of the kingdom of Christ point to the fact that it is intended for this life and not merely eschatological. His final coming will mark the end of the earthly period which is to try and to prove our worth. Besides, if Our Lord had to give to His followers only an eschatological message, why did He entrust Peter with the supreme power of governing and organising His flock unto the consummation of time? The Apostles and the first Bishops knew that they were carrying out the will of Christ when they set about establishing a lasting organisation; this they could not have done had their ideas been limited by the expectation of the near 'parousia.' As Christianity, remarks Batiffol,⁶ recruited its first members from Judaism, it could hardly have taken root in a Jewish soil saturated with pharisaic and apocalyptic teachings; certainly it could not have outlived the disappointment which must necessarily have accompanied the indefinite postponement of the 'parousia.' From the manner, then, in which Christ announced His kingdom, from the description He gave of the same kingdom in the parables of the Gospels, from the mission entrusted to His Apostles in view of all His actions and sayings, we

¹ Matt. xi. 12-15, xii. 28; Luke xvi. 16, xvii. 20-21.

² Matt. x. 24, xiii. 31-33, xiv. 14, xxvi. 13, xxviii. 19; Luke vi. 12-18, ix. 1-6, x. 1-20, xiii. 13-19; Mark iv. 30-32; John iv. 21-24, x. 16, xii. 20-23.

³ Matt. xxi. 33-46, viii. 10-12; Mark xii. 1-12; Luke xx. 9-19, xiv. 16-24, xxi. 24.

⁴ Matt. xiii. 14-30, 47, 50, xv. 1-13, v. 10-12, x. 14-39, xiv. 4-13, v. 33-47; Mark xiii. 5-13; Luke vi. 20-26, x. 10-16, xxi. 8-19, vi. 27-36; John xvi. 1-4, 33.

⁵ Matt. xxvi. 11, v. 3-7, vi. 2-4; Mark xiv. 7, x. 18-31; Luke vi. 20-53.

⁶ *Primitive Christianity*, chap. ii.

have no doubt as to His intention of founding a visible Church in this world. Rightly, therefore, Father Lagrange remarks: 'Si le temps qui suit la mort de Jesus n'est pas un temps de grace messianique, le messianisme est purement et simplement supprimé.'¹

THE ALLEGED ILLUSION OF CHRIST

Loisy grants that the given texts concern the institution of a visible Church, but that they are words of Christ glorified and have no historical value. This would mean that all that is related of the risen Christ is only imaginary; but how, then, will Loisy explain the fact that the whole course of action of the Apostles after the day of Pentecost was based upon these post-resurrection facts, clearly regarded as eminently historical and the very foundation of the faith they preached? At whose command did the Apostles go forth? Be it so, Loisy replies; yet we have the clear statement made by Christ about His imminent coming to establish God's kingdom; Christ was certainly deceived, and the Church cannot, therefore, be anything but a post-apostolic organisation. Loisy forgets that the Gospels use the two terms—'the kingdom of God and the coming of Christ'—in several different senses, and we have to determine their particular meaning in each case from the context. The kingdom of God often signifies, as we have seen, a visible Church on earth; sometimes it bears quite a peculiar meaning, and implies something that is present in the souls of men, as we read in St. Luke:² 'And being asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come? He answered them and said: . . . The kingdom of God is within you.' At other times the kingdom of God signifies a remote and distant event, as in St. Matthew³: 'And I say to you that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven.'

¹ In *Revue Biblique*, 'L'Avènement du Fils de l'Homme,' July, 1906.

² Luke xvii. 20.

³ Matt. viii. 11.

Occasionally by 'the kingdom of God' is meant justice and life everlasting, for the kingdom promised by Christ is very different from that promised to the patriarchs of the Old Law, i.e., the material kingdom of the Promised Land. The Messiah preaches a spiritual kingdom which is not of this world,¹ which requires on our part some preparation for its reception. For this reason Christ insists on penance as a disposition for entering into His kingdom.

The *regnum Dei* of the Gospels, therefore, has sometimes a general and sometimes a particular meaning: in the general sense it implies the supernatural dominion which God exercises on man by guiding him to his destiny through grace and faith in Jesus Christ; in the particular sense it takes a concrete form and is realised in the Church militant and triumphant. The same remarks may be applied analogously to the coming of Christ. At times by 'the coming of Christ' the Gospels mean His coming at the last judgment;² at other times His coming at the death of each man in particular;³ occasionally they mean the manifestation of the divine power through the miraculous works wrought by Christ. If we bear in mind, therefore, that both the kingdom of God and the coming of Christ have a varied meaning as they are used in the Gospel narrative, we shall be able, I think, to reconcile those different texts, some of which would seem to militate against, others to support, the foundation of a Church. As all come from the same source, it is scarcely probable that we shall find any real contradiction in them. It is true that in examining the eschatological sermon we are confronted with no small difficulties, but it may be shown that these difficulties do not predicate any illusion on the part of Christ, nor do they undermine the fact otherwise stated in the Gospels of a divinely organised Church in this world.

¹ John viii. 36.

² Matt. xvi. 17.

³ John xiv. 3.

THEORIES ON THE ESCHATOLOGICAL SERMON

The eschatological sermon is laid down in St. Matthew¹ and in the parallel places of St. Mark and St. Luke.² It must be acknowledged, as we have already noted, that the first Christian generations were in expectation of an approaching end of the world. The modern Rationalist school asserts that such a belief originated in the self-deception of Christ who, in the eschatological sermon, announced the 'imminent parousia.' Their argument is as follows: Christ in foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem stated, first, that the end of the world was at hand; and, secondly, that the men of His generation would be witnesses of that great event. Christ, therefore, is responsible for the deception of His followers. Now, they argue, if these statements came directly from Christ, He is not God's prophet, but if they are the work of the Evangelists, the Gospels are not inspired documents.³ Rationalists of the old school did not admit of a deception in Christ, but they taught that He accommodated Himself to the belief of His disciples and of the Jews, in order to elevate their minds to the divinity of His mission.⁴ Loisy fully championed the modern Rationalist theory from this point of view of the 'parousia,' which, he alleges, reveals the true mind of Christ with regard to the Messianic kingdom.

Rationalists of a milder type assert that the mistaken belief of the early Christians is to be attributed to interpolations in the *logia* concerning the 'parousia,' and this theory seems to be shared also by a few Catholics—too risky, perhaps, in meeting our opponents. A Catholic theologian, Dr. Schell, proposed an explanation similar to that of the advanced Rationalists. Jesus, in the opinion of this writer, was really deceived, but only as man, not as God, in the object of His mission. Needless to say this theory is out of joint with Christian doctrine, and it was rightly

¹ Matt. xxiv. 1-51.

² Mark xiii. 1-37; Luke xxi. 1-36.

³ See Strauss, *Life of Christ*, t. i. pp. 247-261 (Strasbourg, 1864); Renan, *Vie de Jesus*, 3rd ed. t. ii. pp. 335-337; H. J. Holtzmann, *Stalker*, etc.

⁴ See Von Cölln in *Biblische Theologie*, t. ii. § 136; Böhme, etc.

condemned. The general tendency of the Modernist, however, is to favour the advanced Rationalist theory; the historical Christ of the Modernist is only a man and, consequently, He was subject to self-deception. Catholic exegesis excludes interpolations in the *logia* concerning the 'parousia,' and also any exaggeration of the mind of Christ, as it is expressed in the Gospel; they explain the conviction of primitive Christianity by the influence of Jewish traditions which were the cause of a false interpretation of the words of Christ. It may be noted here that the Fathers do not offer much help to the solution of the difficulties involved in this question of eschatology; some of them merely expounded the texts allegorically, others thought that the predictions of the Lord were being verified in their own times, and others simply made a general statement that the time of the coming of Christ is altogether unknown. Owing to Rationalist criticism greater attention has been given to eschatology in recent years, and although Catholic interpreters still continue to differ among themselves in commenting on the eschatological sermon, yet they have been able to demonstrate the falsehood of Modernist and Rationalist criticism. We will group them into three classes.

The first group are those who eliminate from verses 29-31 in St. Matthew and parallel places any allusion to the final judgment.¹ According to these the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, the apparition of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, are only metaphorical figures, referring either to the fall of the Jewish kingdom or to the passing of the Roman empire, or to both. They base their opinion on the following arguments: First, tradition is not certain that the final judgment is here described; secondly, there are other texts mentioning similar phenomena, without any reference to the end of the world.² The

¹ Le Camus, *Life of Christ*, vol. ii. p. 329; Vigouroux in *Man. Bibl. N. Test.*, § 249.

² See Isaias xlii. 9 et seq., xliii. 23, xliii. 2, 3; Jeremiah iv. 20-30; Ezechiel xxii. 7, 8; Daniel viii. 10; Joel ii. 1-3 10, 30, 31: iii. 15; Amos v. 18-20; viii. 8, 9; Micheas iii. 6; Aggeus ii. 7, 8.

second opinion is of those who, starting from verses 21 or 23 of the eschatological sermon, find a direct allusion to the last judgment. This is the theory of Knabenbauer, who quotes in his favour Cajetan, Maldonatus, Schegg, and Schauz.¹ The argument for this opinion is as follows: In verse 23 there is no more question about the destruction of Jerusalem; therefore, Christ has passed to another topic. Indeed, in verse 24 there is question of the pseudo-Christ who, they say, did not exist before the destruction of Jerusalem and who, according to St. Paul (1 Thess. ii. 9), are a sign of the end of time. The third group agree that only verses 29-31 of St. Matthew's Gospel admit of an allusion to the final judgment, but they differ as to their meaning. Some would take 'εὐθέως (immediately)' not with 'after the tribulation of those days,' but with 'the sun shall be darkened.' In this case Christ announced His future coming to take place, not immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, but at a later date, without defining the time. They say that 'immediately' is used in prophetic language to denote even distant future events.² Others affirm that 'immediately' cannot be referred explicitly to the end of the world, because the destruction of Jerusalem and the 'parousia' are mixed up together, although the two events are described as if one followed the other.³ Other interpreters of this third class admit that 'immediately' refers to the end of the world, and they explain away the advent of Christ by saying that the interval between the fall of the Temple and the 'parousia' is a very short one when compared to eternity, and that Christ purposely used this word in order to keep His disciples ever ready for His coming.⁴

The second false statement made by Christ, according to Rationalists, is as follows: 'Amen I say to you, that this generation shall not pass away till all these things be done,'⁵

¹ Knabenbauer in *Matt.*, vol. ii. pp. 337-346.

² Cardinal Capecelatro seems to incline to this opinion; see *Errori del Renan*, p. 337.

³ See Rose, *Évangile selon S. Matt.*, ch. xxiv. (Bloud, 1906).

⁴ A Lapide, *Comm. in St. Matt.*

⁵ *Matt.* xxiv. 34.

where Christ is foretelling the 'parousia,' which should have taken place before the passing of this generation. Some Catholic interpreters among the three given classes tried to prove that 'this generation' implies the human race or the Jewish sect. Although 'this' cannot, of necessity, be referred to the generation living at the time of Christ (for we have instances to prove that the word might be used in a different sense), yet from the whole context it is clear that Our Lord meant His own contemporaries. Otherwise His words would mean: 'The world shall not end before the fulfilment of what I have predicted, i.e., the end of the world,' which would be futile. We may, therefore, grant Rationalists and Modernists that the generation in question is Christ's own generation, and confidently proceed to show that in spite of the difficulties that may remain unsolved in reading the eschatological sermon, yet our opponents could neither prove therein a self-deception in Christ nor undermine the ecclesiology of the Gospels.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE SERMON

It is a rule of common sense that obscure and difficult Scriptural texts bearing on a certain subject are to be explained by those that are clear. Therefore, if we cannot arrive at a clear understanding of Christ's prophecies in all their details, we must refer ourselves to other places in which His mind is unmistakably definite. It is incumbent upon Loisy and Rationalists to show that, in the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew, Christ has in view only an eschatological Church. They fail to give any evidence for this statement; therefore the passages which explicitly prove the foundation of a visible Church on earth do not suffer from the apparent discrepancies of the eschatological sermon.

Besides the opinion of those who, in the same chapter, exclude any reference to the final judgment, before verse 36, does not seem to be untenable. In St. Mark and in St. Luke the words of Christ should be judged by the question

put to Him by the Apostles. In St. Mark and in St. Luke Our Lord speaks of the Temple only,¹ and the Apostles put a two-fold question: 'Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall begin to be fulfilled?'² Therefore, as the questions refer to the destruction of Jerusalem only, we might suppose that the answer given by Christ regards that event only. And admitting, as is generally admitted, the harmonious parallelism of the Synoptics, we should lawfully conclude that in St. Matthew also there is no reference to the end of the world. This plausible view leaves no ground for the assertions of Rationalists; however, we are not forced to take it in order to defend the Church from these higher critics. We much prefer to admit that there is question of the final judgment, this being perhaps more in agreement with tradition; but, even so, there is absolutely nothing to prove that Christ believes in the approaching 'parousia.' The words, 'and immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun shall be darkened,'³ obviously refer to the previous ones in verse 24, where there is question of the false Christs who will appear before the end of days. At any rate there is no reason why they should be joined with the destruction of Jerusalem, foretold in the verses previous to verse 23. Likewise, the words in verse 34, 'Amen I say to you, that this generation shall not pass till all these things be done,' cannot possibly mean the coming of Christ at the end of the world; otherwise the statement in the preceding verse 33 would be equal to the following: 'When you see that My coming is at hand, then you will know that My coming is near,' which is mere tautology. The passage in verse 33 can only signify that the signs of the coming of Christ will be confirmatory of His predictions. Therefore in verse 34, also, 'all these things' do not warrant the coming of Christ at the end of time.

We acknowledge that in reading the whole sermon we cannot easily distinguish all the connecting links, because it is probably a summary of the Lord's assertions at different

¹ Mark xiii. 2-3; Luke xxi. 6. ² Mark xiii. 4; Luke xxi. 7. ³ Matt. xxiv. 29.

times; but, we repeat it again, there is no warrant to infer that the 'parousia' coincides with the fall of the Temple. There is evidence to the contrary rather. It is expressly stated that 'this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations, and then shall the consummation come.'¹ We read the same in St. Mark² and in St. Luke.³ Even if by the 'whole world' we understand the world known at the time of Christ, the 'parousia' cannot synchronize with the fall of Jerusalem, on account of the difficulty of spreading the Gospel. The early Christians, imbued as they were with Jewish traditions, may have believed that the Lord's last coming was at hand, and would take place at the time of the Jewish calamity, but from the very outset Christ puts them on their guard: 'Take heed that no man seduce you.' With reference to Jerusalem He tells them explicitly that 'this generation shall not pass till all these things be done'; but with regard to His last coming He plainly declares to them that 'of that day and hour no man knoweth, but the Father alone,' because, as a messenger from God, He was not commissioned to reveal it to them. To an unbiassed mind the distinction is clear. Father Lagrange, in the *Revue Biblique* (July, 1906, pp. 402-403), thus briefly summarises these ideas:—

Aucun critique ne prétendra que Jésus a tenu tous ces discours d'une seule haleine. L'arrangement, comme dans les discours sur la montagne, est l'œuvre de l'Évangéliste. Mais est-il vrai qu'il plaçait la parousie dans la même perspective que la ruine de Jérusalem? Il suffit de lire pour constater au contraire que tous les traits qu'il a ajoutés ont pour but de les distinguer en marquant très expressément l'incertitude de la parousie et la nécessité d'agir d'après les instructions de Jésus.

From this it follows that it is hardly possible to find a clean cut division of the sermon related by the Synoptics. Yet as the times of the 'parousia' and of the fall of the Jewish Temple are clearly distinguished, the task of the interpreter is thus reduced to differentiating the passages

¹ Matt. xxiv. 14.² Mark xiii. 10.³ Luke xxi. 24.

described. Based, therefore, on the remarks given above, we see that in verses 4-14 of the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew the two facts are narrated indiscriminately; but in verse 14 the day of judgment is accurately fixed by definite circumstances. Then verses 15-22 portray the catastrophe of Jerusalem, and verses 23-31 the coming of Christ. From verse 32 to verse 35 the narrative returns to Jerusalem, and then again to the end of the world. In conformity with hermeneutical laws we note here that a pronoun does not necessarily refer to events immediately preceding it if they do not form the main subject of the narrative; in this case the pronoun is to be connected rather with those that are more remote; hence, as the foremost idea in the first half of the sermon is the downfall of the Jewish Temple the reasons for which we link verses 33 and 34 with this event are justified.

It is not our scope to examine all the other eschatological texts scattered throughout the New Testament; but if these be studied dispassionately, we shall come to the conclusion that the manner used by the Apostles in announcing the 'parousia' denotes at one time the certainty of the fact which is a revealed dogma, and the uncertainty of its chronology which is unknown. Even when the Apostles address the men of their generation as witnesses of the final day, they never warrant any knowledge of the time of such an event, but manifestly show complete ignorance of it. If from the writings of the same Apostles we occasionally discover categorical statements concerning the imminent coming of the Lord, it will be seen that these passages may be applied to the particular judgment of each man at the point of death so that we never meet with assertions defining the time of the last judgment.

CONCLUSION

We will now draw our conclusions against Rationalist and Modernist criticism. First: they fail to establish their theory; from St. Paul down to our own times the kingdom

of Christ has been recognised to be generally the militant Church upon earth, and the Church triumphant in heaven. Secondly, it is equally certain that as Christ had to found the Messianic kingdom foretold by the prophets, the Church He established is the fulfilment of these prophecies, which are not to be confounded with apocalyptic Jewish writings. Thirdly, it is also clear from the words of Christ Himself that the end of the world will not come before the Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached to all peoples and nations; it cannot, therefore, coincide with the fall of Jerusalem, nor can we predicate any self-deception on the part of Christ. Fourthly, it is also a fact that Christ devised and organised His Church before His resurrection, and that the Apostles and the whole of tradition testify to this fact.

The Rationalist and Modernist theory is, therefore, without foundation, and the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel gives no support to their antagonism against the divine institution of the Church. Just as in the cosmogony of Genesis they cannot prove any contradiction before they show the clear meaning of the difficult passages in the Mosaic narrative, neither can they prove a contradiction in the eschatological sermon before they demonstrate the sense of its more obscure references. In spite of the difficulty to construct the eschatological sermon in all its details, the Church of Christ is safe from the attacks of the Modern school. We may leave that school to work out its own amazing theories, confident that it will end in self-contradiction and complete destruction, while we cling steadfastly to Him Who is all truth, wisdom, and knowledge.

F. ROTA, S.J.

PIONEER MISSIONARY LIFE IN THE NORTH-WEST

By PEREGRINUS

LET me first define my terms. The North-west is usually employed with reference to Canada : here it refers to the North-western States of America. It takes in a vast extent of country, from the Great Lakes to the States touching the Pacific Ocean ; the latter are referred to as 'the Coast.' However, this is almost a distinction without a difference, as conditions are similar in Canada and the American North-west. Americans take up claims in Canada, and, *vice versa*, Canadians are pretty much in evidence everywhere in the North-west.

Within the memory of living man this huge territory was inhabited mainly by Indians. These are gradually being restricted to reservations, and the territory that was theirs is being opened up to white settlers. The process is still going on : only last summer was the Fort Peek Indian Reservation declared open for settlement. It attracted quite an amount of notice at the time : the newspapers announced the arrival of crowds at the scene of the drawing, and the winners of the lucky numbers were duly published day by day.

Such an announcement always attracts a crowd. The inducement is 160 acres of virgin soil. From the very nature of the case it is only the hardy, the vigorous, and the enterprising that respond. The settler gets his 160 acres, and nothing else. He has to bring with him his live stock and all his belongings. There is no house, no out-offices. He builds possibly a house of sods, and starts to put in the seed he has brought with him. He next builds

a house of wood, commonly referred to as a shack, and puts in more seed. Then, if things go well with him, a comfortable, solid dwelling-house is erected, a barn, out-offices. A well is sunk, a grove planted. A settler must live continuously on his claim for a certain number of years to make his title good.

There is something very similar between the life of the pioneer settler and the pioneer priest. The latter sets out to his destination, carrying with him a movable altar and vestments. There is no house waiting for him. He has to betake himself to a hotel, or look out for lodgings. Failing to find immediate accommodation he will have to avail himself of the hospitality of a Catholic family. One fine old priest still living, went one better: he took a claim, lived in a shack, and, as it is termed, proved up. Like the settler, the priest, or his successors, must live continuously in the new parish. He, too, must prove his claim.

Having secured a starting-point, the priest's next duty is to discover his people. Some of them are known to him already, at least by repute; others are quite unknown to him, even their neighbours do not know them to be Catholics. The district has possibly had Mass occasionally on week-days, the priest travelling twenty, thirty, even seventy miles. Well, the men will not, as a rule, come on week-days; many of them cannot. Experience shows that Mass on Sundays will be attended by Catholics who never appeared on week-days. Catholics unexpectedly crop up, come out of their burrows as it were, when there is a resident priest and Mass regularly on Sundays. What is more, new Catholic settlers will arrive. Farms are constantly changing hands, and it is notorious that Catholics will not settle where there is no regular Sunday Mass, no resident priest. Negotiations for the purchase of a farm have broken down on that very point. This is so generally felt that, from purely business motives, non-Catholic business men will contribute to the building of a church.

What strikes the priest as he goes round his new

territory is the extent of ground he has to cover. A parish may be half as big as a diocese at home, quite as large as some of them. I know a priest who, in the early days, had charge of a territory as large as several Irish dioceses put together. This sort of thing is bound to happen in new and sparsely-settled areas. At home a town is a parish, or two or three parishes; here two, three, six, eight towns—not very big ones, of course—go to form a parish. And on those towns and in the surrounding country Catholics are scattered, often only a small minority, almost lost amongst their non-Catholic neighbours.

It is true that there are settlements, mainly Catholic. This holds, especially, in the case of Germans, Bohemians, Poles, and French Canadians. There is an obvious explanation in their case—they spoke a common language, and in the beginning their knowledge of English was nil. But the isolated Catholic is always to be reckoned with. Oftener than not he is Irish, or of Irish descent.

The pioneer priest has to travel around, saying Mass anywhere and everywhere—in public halls, schoolhouses, private houses. He will find children unbaptised; men and women who have not done their Easter Duty for years. Let him keep going, and many of them will have done their Easter Duty within a few weeks. As regards the children, there is comparatively little difficulty. Only those parents who are incurably careless, or have all but lost their faith, will fail to avail themselves of the opportunity of having their children prepared for their First Communion, and making it from their own homes. Very often the surest way of getting the elders to start a Christian life is through the children. They approach the altar rails the day the children make their First Communion. Thus a beginning is made. Until they have a resident priest, parents thus situated send their children to the few Catholic schools or academies, or to relations, or to the nearest resident priest, to be prepared for First Communion.

A beginning is now made, but there are difficulties

still ahead. One would be inclined to argue *a priori*: 'Those people have now Sunday Mass regularly for the first time since they settled here. They will come in crowds, and regularly.' That is not how the situation appeals to them. Their view, or rather the view of many of them, seems to be: 'Oh, well, we didn't have Sunday Mass a year ago, five years ago, and we did pretty well. Besides, the horses are tired, or the roads are bad, or 'tis too cold, or we are busy,' etc. To an Irish priest, accustomed to see people go to Mass every Sunday and holiday as a matter of course, the attitude of Catholics, especially in a new mission, comes as a painful shock. They really do not realise the obligation; they do not want to. Some of them make a point of attending Mass at Christmas and Easter. The Easter Duty—no: they will do it some time. And they seem perfectly satisfied with themselves. Sunday Mass seems like any other habit. When it's lost, it's lost, and has to be regained by repeated acts, involving, especially in the beginning, a certain amount of effort.

Things are now fairly satisfactory. Congregations are formed here and there, and the priest has acquired a fair idea of how best to dispose of his Sundays. When the numbers are small he has to content himself with Mass on week-days. His difficulties are by no means over. They are all *ab intra*. It is true that the North-west furnishes specimens of belief that are mere names to the average reader. Russian Mennonites, German Dunkards, German Lutherans, Norwegian Lutherans, Christian Scientists. And there are the American equivalents of the Anglican Church, the Episcopalians, very few in numbers. The strong sects here are the Methodists, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians. I also heard of an organisation called 'The Church of God,' but it has never been my good fortune to meet one of its members. But there is no serious opposition offered by any of those sects. Occasionally, as when they subscribe to a known anti-Catholic paper for themselves, and get it sent to their neighbours, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, they cause annoyance; but definite instances in which these

tactics caused harm are wanting. The difficulties the priest has to encounter are to be found solely amongst his own people. Let me give a few of them.

The first and most serious is the appalling ignorance of their religion that many Catholics display. What else could be expected? In Canada and America many of them were brought up miles from a priest. Whatever they learned was from their parents, and what they got while preparing for their First Communion. How easy it is to forget, especially when practice is divorced from knowledge. I met recently a man who spent years in the mining camps of Alaska. He was standing sponsor for a child. He stumbled through the *Our Father*, and broke down hopelessly in the *Creed*. Many of our Catholics cannot repeat the Ten Commandments. As I have hinted already, such elementary knowledge as the obligations entailed by the Third Commandment is beyond them. As for the Sacraments, many do not know the number. The names and an intelligent explanation of each is beyond the reach of all except the privileged few who have been to Catholic schools or colleges, or have made an exceptionally good preparation for their First Communion. The pulpit orator is sadly out of his element in the North-west: what is wanted here is elementary instruction, and the more elementary the better.

Loss of faith and a lapse into heresy are practically non-existent. The danger is indifference, or, to put it more exactly, paganism. The old, old Epicurean philosophy, the *carpe diem* of Horace, is strongly in evidence. The motto of many seems to me: 'I want to make money, and have a good time.' Even Catholics are affected by it. It is in the air. Protestantism as an attractive force is extinct. They cannot hold their own, much less attract Catholics.

A danger everywhere is that arising from mixed marriages. When Catholics are in a minority they are bound to occur. Here they are numerous. The usual evil results follow—indifference and loss of faith. I can point out over

thirty children, the offspring of mixed marriages, not one of whom has been baptised, or else baptised in heresy. And there their religious life ends. Here, as everywhere, there has been serious leakage through such unions. The evil exists, and will continue. The best partial remedy, and it is only partial at the best, is a resident priest. If he is on the spot to baptise the children as they are born, and to instruct them when they come to the use of reason, the loss will not be so great. But a loss there always will be.

Such is a bare outline of what a priest has to face in a new parish in the North-west. It may not be for many an attractive picture. But the life has its charm. It does not lie in the easy, well-ordered groove of the life of a priest in a parish a hundred or hundreds of years old. It is full of bursts of activity; sometimes it entails downright hardship. Long journeys have to be made; sometimes in cold beyond the imagination of those who live in temperate climes. Then again there are days of inactivity and solitude. It would be a relief to go to the school, but there is no Catholic school to go to. The people are few, can be seen almost without effort, and they have been seen already. There is no clerical society: the nearest priest lives thirty or forty miles off. One is then forced to think, he cannot help it. And the lonely priest reflects that some one has got to make a start; why should not he himself do it? He reflects that he is permitted to bring Mass, instruction, and the Sacraments to people who went without them, and he thanks God for the privilege. In a new mission a commonplace week may pass, but no month passes without hard solid results from his efforts. And he is cheered by the sight of prosperous parishes, whose beginnings were very, very modest. Let me give the history of one of those in the words of a holy woman who was a pioneer herself, and saw things from the beginning. 'Well, Father, when we came here, we were Irish, French, and German. The Irish wanted an Irish priest, the Germans a German, the French a French. When the

priest came from X, only a few of us women went to Mass.'

To-day, that parish has a magnificent church, free of debt, two resident priests, a splendid congregation. Within the last few months, on a special occasion—a week-day it was—1,600 people went to Holy Communion.

Yes. Decidedly it is worth the effort.

PEREGRINUS.

THE WORKING OF THE *NE TEMERE*' DECREE IN ENGLAND

BY REV. CHRISTOPHER SWEENEY, O.P.

AFTER a few years' experience of parish work in a large city, a few thoughts, it seems to me, on the actual working of the *Ne Temere* decree will not be altogether futile. The place the decree has taken in parish work is by no means insignificant. The extra clerical work added to the labours of priests in England, as in other parts of the world, is, at times, somewhat exacting. But on this aspect of the decree there is no need to dwell.

Looked at from the point of view of the common good of the Church, few will deny the need and excellence of the decree. For the Church is ever solicitous for the spiritual welfare of her children, ever ready to lay open to them her treasures, especially the Sacraments, and more always anxious to save those who will hardly save themselves. At the same time the Church recognises that she is not dealing with automatons, but with human nature, human wills, human weaknesses. In consequence, when issuing her decrees, however excellent in themselves, she fully understands that the application of them, in particular instances, may not meet with the responses they were intended to elicit. Whilst, then, all may applaud the general aim of the *Ne Temere* decree, some may have different opinions as to the benefit of its application to non-Catholic countries. Thus some hold that the decree is a blessing, and in a few years will prove itself to be so, once it is rightly understood. Moreover, it will strengthen the obedience of Catholics to the Church, and ensure reverence for the sacrament of Matrimony.

On the other hand, not a few feel the decree to be something of the nature of a bugbear. Things in England, they say, were going nicely until Easter, 1908, when the *Ne Temere* decree upset everything, and instead of smoothing the path of a priest in his parish work, proved to be a stumbling block.

Certainly, there is a great deal to be said for both contentions. I believe that, in a few years, say twenty years, and that is a short time in the life of the Church, the decree will work well, for by that time Catholics and non-Catholics will have grown accustomed to its wholesome provisions.

But it may be asked, and with concern, what of the past few years, and what of the present? How did the decree work, and how is it working now? Most priests can tell their own tale in this matter, and I do not think their experiences differ very much from mine.

It is a matter of satisfaction to note that not only those who would in the ordinary course of things marry in the church, but also large numbers to whom, before 1908, it would have been a matter of indifference whether they married in the church or out of it, make a point of falling in with the intention of the decree. It is true a large number do not fall into line, but have recourse to the registry office, and in some instances to the Protestant church. This is the unsatisfactory feature in the working of the decree. It is precisely at this point where, *at present*, the decree seems to fail. It is also here that the priest has to face difficulties, and who will say that he has always a pleasant time of it! Each priest can count up his own experiences, and reflection on them, in some cases, can hardly be appetising. At all events it can safely be argued that priests of each parish do their best to make the parties fulfil the conditions of the decree.

But what is the result? In some cases there is complete success. Perhaps much of the priest's time has been taken up also; no doubt his patience has been tried, but he has eventually succeeded, and that is the great

point. In other cases, however, there is only partial success. One of the parties consents to come to church, or appear before the priest, and the other party, for various reasons, refuses. Lastly, there is failure, for both parties refuse altogether.

It may be asked, then, how do we account for this want of success or failure? What are the difficulties in the way of the decree? It is a large question, but it may be answered in a brief way.

We must not forget that few laws have ever been promulgated, whether human or divine, that have not met with difficulties and obstacles. And the *Ne Temere* decree is no exception in this respect. That there have been and are difficulties in the way of the *Ne Temere* decree is sufficiently evident from the partial success or failure that has attended its application. Now, what are these difficulties? For the sake of brevity they may be summed up as (1) misunderstanding, (2) carelessness, (3) fees.

1. Up to 1908, in those countries where the Decree *Tametsi* had not been promulgated, Catholics were not bound by it. Hence, for various reasons, Catholic, and Catholic and non-Catholic parties, if they wished to contract marriage, evidently thought it a light matter to be married before the civil authorities, and, in some cases, before non-Catholic ministers. The custom grew as years went by. And since such marriages, so performed, were valid, so far as the parties were concerned, the matter was all right.

The decree of 1908 brought in a change with regard to marriage itself in those countries where hitherto the decree of the Council of Trent had not been promulgated. The first thing the priest had to do was to read and explain the decree, and awaken people's conscience as to its binding force. Immediately difficulties arose. Many saw at once its meaning. Some gathered that, if both parties were Catholics, the marriage had to take place before the priest and two witnesses, or, as we say, in church. If, however, one was a Catholic and the other a non-Catholic, the

marriage could not, so they understood, take place in church. Others, again, took no trouble to clear up any misunderstanding they had about the matter. The philosophical axiom, 'quidquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis,' receives here a good illustration.

It is true that, during the last two or three years, the decree has come to be better known and understood, but such as I have described was the state of things at the beginning.

2. Again, there are the careless Catholics—those who attend church now and then, and those who hardly attend, if at all. They know little or nothing about the decree. Their consciences are not fully alive to the ordinary duties of Catholics, much less to the new obligations. Still the decree binds them also. If the parents were married at the registry office, there is no harm in the children doing likewise. If the neighbours marry there, such Catholics follow suit.

Of course there are exceptions, even amongst the most careless Catholics, and sometimes we find they are anxious to be married in church. In spite of this a large proportion marry outside the church, and oftentimes different circumstances, some needless to mention, have a great deal to do with it. With them, especially in mixed marriages, it is a matter of choosing the line of least resistance.

3. Lastly, there is another difficulty, and it is a financial one. In these days when it is so difficult for large numbers of our Catholic population to earn a living, the registrar's fee and the priest's fee are a large item in their calculations, and a drain on their slender resources. Of course it will be said that in cases where the parties cannot afford two fees the priest would gladly forego his. He may or he may not. He may, moreover, assure such people that he would gladly do so. But that assurance does not meet the difficulty, no matter how kindly done. For it is a curious phenomenon in our Catholic life that, in some Catholics, and especially the really poor, there seems to be ingrained a combined sense of shame and of honour:

of shame, lest, perhaps, they could not look the priest or their neighbours in the face again, for having had the thing done on the cheap; of honour, to such lengths that they would go hungry rather than deprive the Church of her dues.

These, in brief, are the difficulties that have stood and are standing in the way of the successful working of the decree, that act as stumbling-blocks in the good work of a parish. These are the facts priests have had and have to face, and face them they must—but how? Here is wide scope for speculation. Suggestions not a few have often been made. Some say, more regular instructions on the *Ne Temere* decree and on the sacrament of Matrimony are needed, for ignorance must be met by regular instruction. Again, careless Catholics must be reached and visited more often, and watched more vigilantly. Moreover, priests should try to create a stronger Catholic public feeling and opinion on the matter amongst the parishioners. Suggestions and hints such as these must be taken in good part, and not discarded. But they are for the future, and no doubt, if adopted, will have good results.

Leaving the future to look after itself, we may ask: What about the large number of cases partial or complete failures in the face of the decree? What should be done with them? How must the priest deal with such cases? This is a point I want to dwell on, for there are large numbers of such cases in England. I know some will say: ‘Do your best, and if you fail, the concern is not yours.’ Again, others say: ‘Leave them alone, what can you do?’ Some say we should get exemption from the law, as was done in Germany.

Exemption may be desirable, or it may not. To leave them alone does not quite meet the difficulty, for it does not mend matters. ‘To do our best’ is an excellent suggestion, and if we fail the concern is not ours. But the question is: What is our best? What is going to be our best, where only partial success attends our efforts? Have we to rest and run the risk of depriving the ignorant, the

careless, and the poor of perhaps years of sacramental life and blessing, just because of an initial error or poor circumstances? And the motherly feeling of the Church is not slow in showing how we can keep within the decree, and at the same time make allowances for the human side of her children. What, then, is the way she suggests?

It seems to me we cannot do better than take a concrete case by way of illustration. And this is a case not altogether rare even amongst Catholics. William and Jane, both Catholics, married at the registry office after the promulgation in England of the *Ne Temere* decree, Easter, 1908. Sometime later on, Jane, conscience-stricken, often tried to persuade William to rectify the matter by renewing their consent before the parish priest, but William obstinately refused. Jane declared to her parish priest that she could no longer remain in a state of sin. What was she to do?

This is a case a priest may come across any day in his parish. No doubt he will do his best. He will try to persuade William himself and he may fail. What should he do then? Is conscience-stricken Jane, who really wishes to be the wife of William, to find no solution but—separate! Should the priest leave the matter there, as he cannot do more? We can treat this case more gently if we only look at the *Ne Temere* decree a little more closely.

The *Ne Temere* decree is substantially the same as the *Tametsi* decree of the Council of Trent, with a few modifications and one or two exceptions to the general law. It is, in fact, an extension of the *Tametsi* decree. For we find that the Council of Trent, Cap. 1, Sess. xxiv, *De Reform. Matrim.*, decreed that

Those who otherwise than in the presence of the parish priest himself or of another priest acting with the leave of the parish priest or of the Ordinary, and in the presence of two or three witnesses, shall attempt to contract matrimony, the Holy Synod renders altogether incapable of contracting marriage thus, and decrees that contracts of this kind are null and void.

This is the Tridentine law, which was in force wherever promulgated. Where the law was not promulgated as, for instance, in England, marriages performed at the registry office were valid. Since the extension of the Tridentine law by means of the *Ne Temere* decree, such attempted marriages are null and void, for the decree lays down: 'Only those marriages are valid which are contracted before the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place, or a priest delegated by either of these, and at least two witnesses,' according to rules explained further on in the decree. Here, then, is a decree identical with the *Tametsi* decree. The Pope, however, allows two exceptions. They do not affect the case in hand, but may be quoted for the sake of clearness in the matter:

1°. When danger of death is imminent, and where the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place, or a priest delegated by either of these, cannot be had, in order to provide for the relief of conscience, etc. (should the case require it) for the legitimation of offspring, marriage may be contracted validly and licitly before any priest and two witnesses.

2°. Should it happen that in any district the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place or a priest delegated by either of them, before whom marriage can be celebrated, is not to be had, and that this condition of things has lasted for a month, marriage may be validly and licitly entered upon by the formal declaration of consent made by the spouses in the presence of two witnesses.

It is quite clear from the law above stated that the attempted marriage of William and Jane is null and void. Now, how would such a case have been dealt with under the Tridentine law? For it is in the method in use then we ought to have the solution for like cases under the *Ne Temere* law. This method, then, will be of great use in rectifying cases now, and at the same time may, perhaps, afford some consolation to those who have been faulty with regard to the decree. Let us, then, follow our theologians,¹ and see how they dealt with defective cases under the *Tametsi* decree. The first thing to be done was to secure the

¹ Cf. Tanqueray, Lehmkühl, Haine and others—'De revalidatione Matrimonii.'

consent of the parties in the presence of the parish priest and two witnesses, either publicly or privately.

Should, however, this be impossible, then the parties must be got at, step by step, in this wise: 1°. If one or other refuses to contract in the church, consent may be renewed in any decent place. 2°. Should this not succeed, then if one consents to appear before the parish priest and the other only by delegation or letter, or if both wish to contract privately before the confessor, that can be done, with the Bishop's leave. 3°. Again, if, however, one will not consent, under any circumstances, thinking it altogether useless, a *sanatio in radice* should be asked for. 4°. But, if both absolutely refuse to appear before a priest or confessor, nothing remains to be done but to pray for them, for the Church is not accustomed to give dispensations to those who despise her laws.

In the above method of dealing with defective cases, as suggested by theologians and adopted in countries where the *Tametsi* decree had been promulgated before ever the *Ne Temere* decree saw the light, there are broad hints of what the Church expected from human nature when it became a matter of applying the provisions of the decree. And, like a patient mother, she so dealt with the failings of some of her wayward children. Now, in the above suggestions there is one that calls for special mention, No. 3. 'If one, under any circumstances, will not consent, thinking it altogether useless, a *sanatio in radice* should be asked for.'

I have singled out this, because it seems to meet the case of William and Jane, and has a direct bearing on many such cases in England to-day under the *Ne Temere* decree. And I venture to say that many such cases, particularly of mixed marriages, in our large cities and parishes, are left alone, as if nothing further could be done. Meantime conscience-stricken Jane and her like are left unconsoled, though the Church has placed facilities within our reach of putting such cases right.

Of course I know it may be said with truth that

William and Jane are not married in the sight of God; still we must not be too sweeping in our attitude towards such parties, for while civil marriages have not the strict canonical form of matrimony, nevertheless they have the *natural* appearance of matrimony, and such parties seem sufficiently to wish to enter into a matrimonial contract, for there is no idea or intention of fornication, as such. Hence, the Holy See can heal *in radice*, and sometimes does so for an urgent reason, as, for instance, when one of the contracting parties does not wish to renew consent.

What, then, is this *sanatio in radice*, and when can it operate?

A *sanatio in radice* is a dispensation which abrogates a law invalidating a marriage in a particular case, so that a marriage hitherto invalid is made valid *without new consent*, and, indeed, not only from the time of dispensation, but from the beginning, and thence all effects that spring from the invalidating law are taken away.

Note that there is an abrogation of the law invalidating marriage in a particular case, and without requiring new consent.] I have italicised *without new consent* in the definition, because this dispensation heals *in radice*, i.e., in the consent itself and from the beginning. And this dispensation can operate under certain conditions; and what are they?

They are four. It is required—(a) That the diriment impediment be of ecclesiastical law only, for in other laws the Church cannot heal a vitiated consent; (b) that the consent be a matrimonial consent, i.e., given with the intention of contracting matrimony; (c) that the consent given virtually lasts up to the time of the conceded dispensation; (d) that there is a grave reason.

A reason is considered grave: (1) If one party cannot be induced to renew consent, although he wish to remain in matrimony; (2) If the nullity of the marriage be known to one party only, and the other cannot be warned without a *grave incommodum*; (3) If both parties are not conscious of the nullity and a grave reason exists of not revealing

the impediment; (4) If both parties know of the nullity, but cannot be induced to renew their consent because of insuperable prejudice, or if a *sanatio in radice* is necessary for the legitimation of children.

Such, then, was the thorough way of meeting difficulties in the application of the *Tametsi* decree. There was no question of leaving matters severely alone. It was rather a matter of finding a solution somehow or another. And the argument holds good that since the *Ne Temere* decree is simply an extension of the *Tametsi* decree, with various changes and modifications, the same facilities which the Church, in her wisdom and foresight, provided for rectifying particular cases under the *Tametsi* decree, should also be extended and used for particular cases under the *Ne Temere* decree.

And I do not think we need fancy that we are asking for exceptional treatment in the matter of applying for and using such dispensations. The law allows them; cases demand them. Precisely, then, in this way should we meet the difficulties in the case of William and Jane and like cases throughout the country. And in so acting we shall be doing something that will console conscience-stricken Jane and many like her. And, indeed, she has a clear case. There is no diriment impediment of ecclesiastical law. Their consent is matrimonial, for it has the *natural* appearance of marriage, though not the strict canonical form. Nevertheless, they sufficiently seem to wish to enter the matrimonial state. The consent lasts and there is a grave reason, for it is considered grave, 'if one party cannot be induced to renew consent, although he wishes to remain in matrimony.'

I observe, then, that the *Ne Temere* decree is, so far as my experience goes, making headway, though gradually, and that its benefits will be more and more appreciated as time goes on. The number of marriages in church, where both parties are Catholics, is on the increase, and the sense of duty in this matter is becoming keener and more widespread. Again, the number of mixed marriages in church

is becoming more numerous. This, perhaps, may be a feature of the working of the *Ne Temere* decree that may seem ugly to priests who are strongly opposed to mixed marriages. I do not at the same time mean to say that mixed marriages in themselves are becoming more numerous, but that the more that take place in church will mean a corresponding decrease in the registry office marriages. In reality, then, it is a consoling feature of the decree, for it shows that the decree is making headway slowly, and, moreover, it enables us to keep in touch with such parties.

A word in conclusion. Great numbers of marriages, both Catholic and mixed, have taken place in the registry office and Protestant church in England since the promulgation of the *Ne Temere* decree, Easter, 1908. Numbers of these attempted marriages have been rectified, but a great number have not. And it seems to me a greater excuse for a liberal use of the dispensation *sanatio in radice* exists to-day than will exist fifty years hence.

CHRISTOPHER SWEENEY, O.P.

GEORGE BROWNE, FIRST PROTESTANT ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN

BY W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD, MUs.D., K.S.G.

II

ON July 4, 1537, as we learn from the *Calendar of Deeds of Christ Church, Dublin*,¹ William Power, Archdeacon of Dublin, declares that, in pursuance of a mandate from George, Archbishop of Dublin, he has installed Robert Payneswick, late Canon of the Monastery of Llanthony, as Prior of Christ Church. Thus the Deanery of St. Patrick's and the Priory of Holy Trinity were secured for the propagation of the new doctrines. Two months later, Browne drew up 'the Form of the Beads,' directing prayers for the King as Supreme Head, and for renunciation of the Pope, but it met with no acceptance.

Evidently Browne took up his residence at Tallaght, because, on September 27, 1537,² he wrote from that address to Cromwell, detailing his efforts to spread the new tenets, and adding that 'he will send Cromwell's fee as soon as the Michaelmas rents come in.' Some months later, on January 8, 1538, Browne confided to Cromwell that 'not one preacher will open his lips in any pulpit for the manifestation of the King's Supremacy,' and that the Observants would in no wise listen to him. He adds that 'not a single Bishop or Archbishop but himself, made by the King, but is repelled, even now, by provision.' And, the saddest part of the whole wretched business was that the Lord Deputy continually thwarted

[For Part I see I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. iv. pp. 571 et seq.]

¹ *Cal. of Christ Church Deeds*, No. 427.

² *Cal. of Letters and Papers*, vol. xii. Part ii. p. 538.

Browne 'by often imprisonment, and also expelling me mine own house.'¹

The monasteries were now doomed, and ere the close of the year 1537 thirteen religious houses were formally dissolved, viz., the Cistercian Abbeys of Baltinglass, Bective, Graignamanagh, Dunbrody, and Tintern; the Priors of Regular Canons of Trim, Duleek, Ballybogan, Holmpatrick, Timolin, and Ferns; and the nunneries of Hogges and Graney. It was also resolved to secularise the Priory of Holy Trinity, but this did not take place for another year.

During the early part of the year 1538 Browne and the 'reformed' Bishop of Meath (Staples) fell out, and, as we learn from the Archbishop's letter to Alen, on April 15,² Staples called him 'heretick and beggar,' following this up by a sermon at Kilmainham, on Palm Sunday, in which he railed against Browne, even so far as to exhort the congregation 'to give no credence unto me whatsoever I said, for afore God he would not.' Not long afterwards, on May 5,³ Thomas Agard wrote to Cromwell that 'God's Word' was only set forth by 'the Archbishop of Dublin, Lord Butler, the Master of the Rolls, the Treasurer, and one or two more, which are of a small reputation here.' From a further letter, written by Browne to Cromwell, on May 8,⁴ it appears that 'the form of the beads' got scant recognition, and though he imprisoned Prebendary Humphrey, of St. Patrick's, for contemning the King's authority, yet that, out of twenty-eight prebendaries, there was 'scarce one that favoereth God's Word.' Less than a fortnight later, on May 20,⁵ Browne informs Cromwell that the Lord Deputy had released Humphrey from custody 'to my great rebuke.' He adds: 'When that I was at the worst, I was in better case than I am now, what with my Lord Deputy, the Bishop of Meath, and the pecunious Prior of Kilmainham, God send remedy, Who

¹ *State Papers*, vol. ii. p. 539.

² *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 1.

³ *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 569.

⁴ *State Papers*, vol. iii. pp. 6, 7.

⁵ *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 8.

ever have your Lordship in His safe tuition.' An important postscript is added: 'I have committed now of late in to ward the Bishop of Meath's suffragan, which, in his sermon, prayed first for the Bishop of Rome, then for the Emperor, and at last for the King's Grace, saying, "I pray God he never depart this world until that he hath made amends." What shall a man think be the Bishop that hath such a suffragan.' Unfortunately, Browne does not give the name of the 'suffragan of Meath' that he had imprisoned, but it was likely Bishop O'Higgins, of Clonmacnois.

Bishop Staples, of Meath, on June 17, 1538,¹ wrote to St. Leger complaining bitterly of the 'Bishop of Dublin' whom 'pride and avarice hath ravished from the right remembrance of himself.' He suggests that the King be 'recognised King of Ireland,' and thus that Ireland will soon be brought to due obedience. He concludes: 'I pray you most heartily to recommend me to good Master Moyle, and if ye both can preserve the poor soul from the purgatory of the Bishop of Dublin, I will give every of you one Mass penny. Alas, poor soul!'

In connexion with the suppression of the monasteries, there is an oft-quoted statement that in 1536 there was a grant of 370 religious houses made to the King, the annual value of which was £32,000. This statement is copied by the late Cardinal Moran in his *Archbishops of Dublin* (p. 16), and by Canon Healy in his *History of the Diocese of Meath*, published in 1908. The fact is, that at the close of the year 1537 there were but thirteen religious houses suppressed, and it was not till April 7, 1539, that Henry sent over a Commission for the suppression of all the religious houses in Ireland.

Again, it has been stated that Archbishop Browne burned all the images and relics and the Staff of Jesus, in 1538, but these events must be referred to the year 1539, when the Holy Trinity Priory was formally

¹ *State Papers*, vol. iii. p. 29.

suppressed. The famous image of Our Lady of Trim was still unmolested in October, 1538, when 'Lord Deputy Grey knelt devoutly before it and heard three or four Masses,' as stated by Thomas Alen in a letter to Cromwell (October 29).¹

On New Year's Day, 1539, the Archbishop of Dublin preached in Kilkenny Cathedral, in pursuance of a Royal Commission 'for publishing the King's injunctions, setting forth the Word of God, and the King's Supremacy, together with the plucking down of idols, and the extinguishing of idolatry and the Bishop of Rome's authority,' etc. The following day a Sessions was held, at which numerous malefactors were executed. On the Sunday Browne preached in New Ross, and again in Wexford, on the Feast of the Epiphany, after which other 'malefactors were likewise put to execution.'² On the Sunday after the Epiphany Browne preached in Waterford, and on the day following Sessions were held, when four felons were hanged, 'accompanied with another thief, a frier, whom, among the residue, we commanded to be hanged in his habit, and so to remain upon the gallows, for a mirror to all others his brethren to live truly.'

On January 18, 1539, the Council of Ireland held a Sessions at Clonmel, and on the Sunday the Archbishop of Dublin preached 'in the presence of all the Bishops of Munster.' It was here at Clonmel that Browne's eloquence produced (according to the letter of the Council, dated February 8,³) the magnetic result of winning over 'two Archbishops and eight Bishops,' who publicly took the Oaths of Succession and Supremacy. This statement is certainly not convincing, and will not stand investigation. As a matter of fact there were not ten Bishops in Munster, and of these at least two were not present. It is very significant that not a single name is given of the ten Bishops who are alleged to have been present; in fact, Hamilton's *Calendar* only gives eight unnamed Bishops.

¹ *State Papers*, vol. iii. pp. 102, 103.

² *Ibid.* p. 111.

³ *Ibid.* p. 117.

But Browne was known to be a liar, and therefore, for the present, we shall pass over the unconvincing narrative.

On Browne's recommendation, Richard Nangle, O.S.A., Provincial of the Irish Austin Friars, had been appointed by the King as Bishop of Clonfert, and duly consecrated by Browne, but the Pope provided Roland de Burgo, who ousted Nangle. On November 10, 1537, Richard Culoke writes to Brabazon from Galway¹ that the see of Clonfert was 'in controversy between the nominees of the King and the Pope,' and Nangle had to leave. Browne writes to Cromwell, under date of February 16, 1539, and states that he had provided Dr. Nangle as a suffragan, 'who will set forth as well the Word of God, as our Prince's causes, *in the Irish tongue*.' He adds² that Nangle had been 'expulsed from Clonfert,' and that 'a Rome runner [Dr. de Burgo] who came in, by provision, supported in the same by one MacWilliam, a naughty, traitorous person, governor of these parts, to whom the said Dr. Nangle, my suffragan, showed the King's broad seal, for justifying of his authority, which the said MacWilliam little esteemed, but threw it away and vilipended the same.' Browne also mentions that the Lord Deputy had not only usurped his palace of St. Sepulchre's, but had deposed Dominick Terry, Bishop of Cork (who had been nominated by the King), and 'had promoted to the same a Grey Friar, one of the holy confessors of the late Geraldines, even as rank a traitor as ever they were.' This last statement was a deliberate untruth, inasmuch as the Grey Friar, Lewis MacNamara, O.F.M., had been provided by the Pope, but it was doubtless written with a view of injuring the reputation of Lord Deputy Grey.³

On May 21, 1539, the Lord Deputy and Council wrote to Cromwell⁴ asking that 'for the common weal of this land,' six religious houses might be allowed to stand and

¹ Hamilton's *Calendar*, i. p. 34.

² *State Papers*, vol. iii. p. 122.

³ Renehan, *Collections on Irish Church History*, i. 179.

⁴ *State Papers*, vol. iii. p. 130.

continue, on political and educational grounds, inasmuch as the King would gain far more by their continuance than by their suppression. From the same letter we learn that the three Commissioners for the dissolution of all the Irish monasteries were the Lord Chancellor (John Alen), the Archbishop of Dublin, and Mr. Brabazon—a noble trio of zealots.

Between May, 1539, and December of the year 1540 the work of dissolving the monasteries went on apace, and the farce of 'voluntary surrender' was gone through. Christ Church was secularised formally on December 12, 1539, and the Prior and Canons were transformed into Dean, Precentor, Chancellor, and Treasurer, 'like St. Patrick's.'¹ Lord Leonard Grey had got the Nunnery of Graney and the Abbey of Inislounagh; William Wyse got the Priory of St. John's, Waterford; Thomas Alen got the Priory of Naas; Robert Delman, Tristernagh Priory; Edmund Redman, the Priory of St. John the Baptist, Dublin; Walter Peppard, St. Mary's Abbey, Dublin, and so on. Of course it is well known that the pensions promised to the religious that voluntarily (!) surrendered were only on paper, and though some were sporadically paid, others were not.

On May 19, 1540, Archbishop Browne² wrote to Essex (Cromwell had recently been created Earl of Essex): 'Since that ever I heard the name of Ireland first the country was never further out of order, howsoever my Lord Deputy hath written. There be neither English nor Irish but be glad of his departure. Would to God that he might be tried by the country.' He confides to his friend that when he had called Cardinal Pole a 'papish Cardinal,' Grey had retorted and called Browne 'poleshorn knave friar.' Not long afterwards Lord Grey was sent to the Tower and executed, and on July 28, Cromwell, Lord Essex, was beheaded!

Naturally, Browne put in a claim for some of the spoils

¹ *Cal. of Christ Church Deeds*, No. 431.

² *State Papers*, vol. iii. p. 208.

of the monasteries, and so we are not surprised to find that on March 13, 1540-1, he was leased the site of the Augustinian Friary of Fethard, Co. Tipperary,¹ with appurtenances, to hold for twenty-one years, at a rent of £5 9s. 8d.

Not long afterwards it would seem that Browne's influence had won over Thady Reynolds, Bishop of Kildare (appointed by the Pope on November 15, 1540), because on May 23, 1541,² we find a pardon granted to 'Thady Reynolds alias Mac Raynaldi, chaplain, upon surrendering his bulls of appointment to the bishopric of Kildare.' Reynolds (a native of the diocese of Ardagh), who had been Rector of Clonard, Rector of Clongell, and Vicar of Galtrim, probably acknowledged Henry's supremacy, but William Meade had replaced him³—the first Protestant Bishop of Kildare—of which see he had been Dean since 1530.

Parliament assembled on June 12, 1541, and Henry VIII was proclaimed King of Ireland. A Solemn High Mass, followed by a *Te Deum*, was sung by the Archbishop of Dublin. The subsequent submission of the Irish chiefs, and their taking the Oath of Supremacy, can only be explained on the score that allegiance to Henry instead of the Pope was regarded by them as of a political nature.

On May 1, 1542, Browne's friend, Dr. Richard Nangle, who had been 'expulsed' from Clonfert, was consoled with the Rectory of Ardrahan,⁴ which, however, he only enjoyed seven or eight months, as his death occurred in the following January. Browne himself was forgiven the sum of £250 (which he had owed Lord Rochford and Cromwell as a *douceur* for his appointment to the see of Dublin in 1536) by the King, on July 5, 1542.⁵ Five days later

¹ Fiants of Henry VIII, No. 168.

² Ibid. No. 187.

³ Comerford gives the name as William (Meade), relying on Brady, but the *State Papers* give Thomas. However, William is correct, because, on October 18, 1539, the Lord Deputy had recommended William Meade, Dean of Kildare, for the bishopric.

⁴ Fiants of Henry VIII, No. 298.

⁵ Hamilton's *Calendar*, p. 63.

(July 10) Walter Tyrrell, of Dublin, in consideration of £114 13s. 4d., was granted the site of the Augustinian Friary, Dublin, with appurtenances, 'to hold for ever by the service of a twentieth part of a knight's fee and a rental of 6s. 1d.'¹

On February 28, 1546, Archbishop Browne wrote a letter to the King in regard to the controversies raging between the Lord Deputy (St. Leger) and the Earl of Ormonde. Although he defends the Lord Deputy, he adds: 'But one thing I will say, to be plain with your Majesty, I think they be weary of us all that be Englishmen here.' He suggests that the King should send for the Deputy and Ormonde, and examine the differences for himself.²

As is well known, Ormonde went across to England, and was poisoned at a supper at Ely House in Holborn, on October 17, 1546.

Henry VIII died on January 30, 1547, and was succeeded by Edward VI. One of the first schemes of the new reign was to dissolve the Cathedral of St. Patrick's, reducing it to the level of a parish church. Archbishop Brown suggested that it be converted into a University, and that the College be called 'Christ's College of the foundation of Edward VI.' However, in 1547, the Palace of St. Sepulchre was given to the Lord Deputy, and the Deanery House was given to the Archbishop, the Vicar's Hall being made a Grammar School, with Matthew Talbot as schoolmaster, and William Talbot as usher.³ On March 3, 1548, the residence of the Minor Canons of St. Patrick's was converted into an alms-house for twelve poor men.

In November, 1548,⁴ Browne was accused of 'neglect of duty in the government of the Church,' and was also charged with 'alienations and leases in reversion,' and for his 'undecent sermon' in September, and letters received by him from Irishmen. Evidently he managed to explain matters satisfactorily, because, on April 27, 1550,⁵ he

¹ Fiants of Henry VIII, No. 323.

² *State Papers*, vol. iii. p. 557.

³ Fiants of Edward VI, No. 100.

⁴ Hamilton's *Calendar*, i. p. 94.

⁵ Fiants of Edward VI. No. 472.

received pardon from the King. This pardon was confirmed on June 30.

On July 12, 1550, Browne consecrated Thomas Lancaster as Protestant Bishop of Kildare, in succession to William Meade, deceased. It is worth noting that Lancaster was consecrated *a second time* as Archbishop of Armagh, on June 13, 1568, on which latter occasion he preached his own consecration sermon. At the close of August Browne also consecrated Robert Travers as Protestant Bishop of Leighlin.

As yet the English Liturgy had not been introduced into Ireland, but on Easter Sunday, 1551, Archbishop Browne inaugurated the Anglican service in Christ Church Cathedral, on which occasion he preached a sermon in vindication of the new tenets, his text being: 'Open Thou mine eyes, that I may see the wonders of Thy law.' It is worth noting, however, that 'the whole service of the Communion' had to be translated into *Latin*—a work done under the supervision of Lord Deputy St. Leger, although opposed by Bishop Quinn of Limerick.¹ I may add that, by the fifteenth section of the Act of Uniformity, in 1560, it was enacted that 'it shall be lawful to say and use the Matins, Evensong, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and administration of each of the sacraments and all their common and open prayer *in the Latin tongue*' in those churches where the English language is not understood.

On August 3, 1551, George, Archbishop of Dublin, united the Churches of St. Brigid of Stillorgan and Kilmacud to the Church of St. Fintan of Clonkeen—the former union of Kilmacud with the Church of St. Mary of Donnybrook being first revoked.²

The celebrated disputation which is said to have taken place 'at George Browne's Palace of St. Sepulchre's in Dublin,' between Archbishop Dowdall of Armagh and Bishop Staples of Meath, on May 1, 1551, is more likely

¹ Hamilton's *Calendar*, p. 110.

² *Cal. of Christ Church Deeds*, No. 444.

wrongly dated, and, as has been pointed out by Father T. Gogarty,¹ may have taken place on May 1, 1550; but there was another discussion in June, 1551, as to the use of the Liturgy 'being read or sung in English,' held at St. Mary's Abbey before Sir James Croft,² at which Dowdall strenuously defended the Mass and devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and withdrew, after taunting Staples with not observing the oath of allegiance to the Holy See he took at his consecration.

In July, 1551, the Primate retired to the Continent, whereupon Browne, in order to make the see of Armagh subordinate to that of Dublin, petitioned for the primacy to be transferred to the see of Dublin. Browne's letter to Dudley, Earl of Warwick, dated from Dublin, August 6, 1551, is most interesting.³ He begins by accusing Sir Anthony St. Leger of 'papistical practices,' and goes on to denounce Dowdall for continuing 'the massing, holy water, candlemas candles, and such like.' Sir Ralph Bagnall called the Primate 'errante traytore,' whereupon Sir Thomas Cusack (Chancellor) replied, 'No traitor.' He then describes the flight of the Primate, who wrote to the Chancellor 'that *he would never be bishop where the holy Mass was abolished.*' Finally, Browne urges his claim for the primacy, and commends Sir James Croft.

On August 28, 1551, Browne was licensed to alienate to John Chaloner the island of Lambay; and on September 3, he succeeded in getting his friend Lancaster, Bishop of Kildare, appointed to the Deanery of Ossory, *vice* Lewis Tedder, deceased.⁴ On October 20 his ambition was gratified in being granted 'the dignity of Primate of all Ireland,' under King's letter of September 9.

Sir James Croft, on November 11, in announcing the vacancies in the sees of Armagh, Cashel, and Ossory, recommended Thomas Leverous for either of the two latter

¹ *Archivium Hibernicum*, vol. i. pp. 264-5.

² *Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 246-251. I have a suspicion that these two Disputations are to be attributed to the inventive faculty of Master Robert Ware.

³ *State Papers*, Edw. VI, vol. iii. No. 45.

⁴ *Faints* of Edward VI, Nos. 835 and 839.

⁵ *Ibid.* No. 855.

sees, and describes him as one who, by reason of his 'learning, discretion, and good living,' was 'the metest man in this realm, and best able to preach both in the English and Irish tongue.'¹ For Armagh he suggests that some 'discreet man' be appointed, 'such a man as had a living in England to maintain himself.'

It does not appear that the grant of the Vicars Choral residence in St. Patrick's Close for the purpose of a Grammar School was immediately acted on, because, on October 28, 1552, Edward VI again formally assigned the said house, and appointed Patrick Cusack as Master, during pleasure, at a salary of £20 a year.²

In August, 1552, the see of Armagh was offered to Dr. Richard Turner, 'a man merry but witty withal,' but he declined it. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in September, urged Turner to accept it, but in vain. At length, on October 28, Hugh Goodacre was appointed by Edward VI as first Protestant Archbishop of Armagh, and he was duly consecrated in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, on February 2, 1553, by Archbishop Browne. He only survived his consecration twelve weeks, and died on May 1. Meantime, the Pope, on January 23, 1553, appointed Dowdall as Primate, and rehabilitated him as Archbishop.³

Browne was now nearing the end of his tether. King Edward VI died on July 6, 1553, and Queen Mary was crowned on October 1. Bale, Bishop of Ossory, fled from Kilkenny, on September 9, but when he reached Dublin, Archbishop Browne refused to entertain him. Sir Anthony St. Leger was appointed Lord Deputy of Ireland, and took the oath of office in Christ Church Cathedral on November 19, after hearing a Solemn Mass.

On March 12, 1554, Queen Mary reinstated Dowdall in the see of Armagh, and bestowed on him the title of Primate of All Ireland 'of which he had been deprived by patent, contrary to justice.' At the same time George Browne's

¹ Hamilton's *Calendar*, p. 118.

² *Fiants of Edward VI*, No. 1077.

³ Brady, *Episcopal Succession*, i. p. 218.

patent was cancelled. Two months later, on May 10, the Privy Council of England wrote to the Lord Deputy of Ireland to send over Archbishop Browne to London, doubtless, with a view of an examination of his religious views. The old religion was formally restored by Act of Parliament, and, of course, a married Bishop like Browne had to go; but as Ware naively adds, 'had he not been married he had been expelled, having appeared so much for the Reformation.' Brady says that Browne was dispensed by Cardinal Pole, but that he was deposed by Queen Mary.¹ Anyhow, he disappears from history in 1554, and on June 21, 1555, Hugh Curwin was provided by the Pope as Archbishop of Dublin, being consecrated on September 8 following.² Thomas Leverous was appointed Dean of St. Patrick's, in 1554, and the Cathedral was restored (by a charter of Philip and Mary) to all its ancient dignity and privilege. Since then Dublin has enjoyed the peculiar distinction of having two cathedrals.

Browne's character has been portrayed in no complimentary terms by Bale, his contemporary, who describes him as 'an epicurious archbishop, a brockish swine, a dissembling proselyte and a very pernicious papist'; and accuses him roundly of 'drunkenness and gluttony.' Moreover, the ex-Carmelite friar and sometime Protestant Bishop of Ossory makes due allowance for the corruption of his own 'reformed' clergy, 'alleging for their vain and idle excuse the lewd example of the Archbishop of Dublin, who was always slack in things pertaining to God's glory.'

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

¹ Brady, *Episcopal Succession*, i. p. 328.

² On February 22, 1555, Queen Mary issued a licence to the Dublin Chapter to elect an Archbishop, and recommended Curwin.

NOTE.—It is only right to acknowledge the invaluable help given me in the preparation of this paper by Father M. H. MacInerney, O.P., who copied numerous documents for me in the British Museum. I must also thank Mr. S. C. Ratcliff, M.A., of the Public Record Office, London, for collating and verifying references with the original documents.

TOTAL ABSTINENCE¹

BY VERY REV. JOHN T. MURPHY, C.S.Sp.

I CAN assure you that I have recourse to no mere commonplace when I say that I am very pleased to have an opportunity of addressing you, the students of this College, under the auspices of the Total Abstinence Society. Maynooth has many glories to its credit during the well-nigh century and a quarter of its existence. It has been wound up with the preservation and the progress, spiritual and temporal, of our people, as no other institution in the land and, probably, as no similar institution in the world. The older generation of Maynooth men rightly were, and are, *laudatores temporis acti*. One of my own earliest recollections is the perusal of letters written seventy years ago, by an uncle, who lies buried here, to his uncle, who had been among the earliest students, setting forth the achievements of the *Alma Mater*. But, I think, the most devoted votaries of the glorious past will readily agree that modern Maynooth, ever since its emancipation from the trammels of official connexion with an alien government, has risen more fully than ever before to its mission as the National Seminary of Ireland. Among the many phases of development in modern Maynooth, there are two, especially, which have elicited the grateful admiration of Irishmen at home and abroad. I refer to the well-ordered activities displayed by the students of recent years, and, consequently, by the younger generation of Irish priests, to revive and foster our ancient Irish tongue, and to promote, by intelligent teaching and generous example, the sacred cause of Total Abstinence. We are concerned

¹ Address to the students, under the auspices of the Total Abstinence Society of Maynooth College, December 8, 1914.

this evening with the latter subject alone. Maynooth was very much *en evidence* at the recent National Total Abstinence Congress, in the person of our distinguished chairman of this evening, Rev. Dr. Coffey, to whose initiative, persistent hard work, and organising ability so much of our success was due.

I realise that in addressing you on this subject, I am addressing no ordinary audience. You are the Levites of to-day, the *principes populi Dei* of to-morrow. It is chiefly, therefore, with a view to your future ministry that I shall try to treat the subject of Total Abstinence. But, since the efficacy and fruitfulness of our ministry, in this, as indeed in all other respects, depends on our personal character and example—*virtus ab Illo exibat*—we must be firmly set, in mind and heart, in theory and practice, on the subject ourselves, if we wish to utilise seriously our splendid opportunities for inculcating it unto others. In the domain of morals no man can effectively teach that which he does not practice. Cicero said, rightly, that none but a good man could make a good speech on a good subject. The same truth is expressed by the well-known author of the *Ars Poetica* :

Si vis me flere, dolendum est

Primum ipsi tibi ; tunc tua me infortunia laedet.

It was this deep truth which St. Peter had in mind when he appealed to the Elders—the clergy—to make themselves ‘forma gregis ex animo.’ St. Paul, too, had it in mind, when he lovingly admonished his beloved disciple : ‘Attende tibi et doctrinae. . . . Hoc enim faciens, et teipsum salvum facies, et eos qui te audient.’ And we have the highest teaching of all in the example of the Divine Master, of whom it is expressly written : ‘Coepit facere et docere.’ We, the ambassadors of Christ, must first live that which we ambition to teach. Of course, there may be cases where strong faith will lead the very good to follow the advice given by Our Lord to the faithful whom He was addressing : ‘Omnia ergo quaecunque

dixerint vobis, servate et facite : secundum opera vero eorum nolite facere ; dicunt enim et non faciunt.' But the weak, the wavering, the strongly tempted, the stricken victims of chronic disease will never be persuaded unto change and steadfastness, on the lines of strict sobriety, unless the teaching given, the words uttered, proceed evidently from the abundance of the heart and the conviction of the mind made apparent by the living example of the highest form of sobriety—Total Abstinence.

This being so, I shall, with your kind indulgence, address myself to the subject of Total Abstinence, from the twofold point of view of personal well-being and ministerial fruitfulness. In other words, I propose to set forth a plea for Total Abstinence for its own sake, independently of all other considerations ; and, secondly, I shall show that it is a plant clamouring for special cultivation to-day in this chosen vineyard of the Lord, to which you are called, and to which you will soon be appointed, to go and bring forth fruit, and fruit that will remain. The most precious fruit, outside that produced by direct sacramental work, which you may ever hope to cultivate in the Irish vineyard, in your time, will be that borne on the stem of Total Abstinence.

In the first place, Total Abstinence from alcoholic beverages is wise and reasonable in itself, apart from all considerations of duty or of social relations. And this is true, whether we consider it from the lower standpoint of nature and reason, or from the higher ground of faith and Christian perfection. Confining our thoughts for the moment to the purely natural order, we find ourselves in presence of one of the two strongest instincts of animated nature, that of self-preservation ; that is, the preservation of the individual being as distinct from that of the species. It is rightly said to be the 'first law of nature.' For the fulfilment of this law, the most essential requisite is food and drink. No organic being can live without food and moisture—the latter to be contained in the food, or else to be supplemented by liquid. The constant carrying out of

this law is wisely secured by the Author of nature, who has so organised every living being that the taking of food and drink is craved for at suitable intervals, and that the satisfaction of this craving is accompanied by a very keen delight. Indeed, a 'hunger strike' must be reckoned amongst the most bitter sacrifices, whilst a 'drink strike' would seem to be utterly impossible. Men and women may abstain from food for a considerable time—even up to a point where exhaustion would render them insensible—but absolute abstention from liquid seems to be beyond human endurance. It is not hunger, but thirst, that has frequently driven the wrecked and forlorn mariners to imbibe the maddening, death-giving brine, or cast lots for one another's blood. It is certain that of all the physical sufferings of the Crucified One the bitterest was expressed by that cry of anguish, *Sitio*. The ancient poet¹ who sang "Ἀριστον μὲν ὕδωρ might well have added καὶ ἀναγκασιότατον. This imperative need for moisture in support of every organism is borne out by the fact that the human body is composed of about seventy per cent. liquid. A very large body would dwindle down to something very small indeed, if dried up after the manner of an Egyptian mummy. Let no one, however, think that this fact rather militates against Total Abstinence. The liquid so absolutely needed by our body is, as a rule, amply supplied by the mixed food which people usually take. And among the most marked blessings of Total Abstinence is that he who practises it is scarcely ever thirsty, whereas he who imbibes freely alcoholic drinks is, or thinks he is, at any hour of day or night, what is termed 'dhry.'

The food and drink, or moisture, thus absolutely required for the sustentation of individual life are eagerly sought and found and utilised by fish and insect, bird and beast, under the guidance and impelling influence of the instinct of self-preservation. Man is endowed with the same instinct, for the purposes and needs of his bodily life. But man is not the helpless creature of instinct that

¹ Pindar, *Olympia I*, strophe a.

the animal is. Man is given a higher, nobler principle to direct and determine his actions—the faculty of reason. The animal is not free to go against his instinct. If it is hungry, in presence of suitable food, it must eat; if thirsty, it must drink. Man may, for some reasonable purpose, resist the one and the other. The convalescent from fever has frequently to restrain his craving for food. I have known patients to suffer the agonies of extreme thirst, after certain operations, rather than take any liquids, in accordance with the doctor's instructions. We know that higher motives than bodily health will move man to resist his appetite for food or drink, even when apparently necessary. A case in point, which came under my notice a few years ago in the Holy Land, occurs to me. In early August, when the heat and drought in Palestine are simply terrific, a party of Russian pilgrims met a corresponding party of French about half-way between Canaan and Lake Gennezareth, in the same desolate region where the last great battle had been fought and lost by the Crusaders. The Russians were parched with heat and thirst, and applied to the French for some relief. The latter had nothing to offer but some milk, which the pious Russians declined, as it was, they said, their season of fast, in preparation for the Assumption, when they were not permitted to use milk; and so they passed on thirsty. For anyone acquainted with the climatic conditions of Galilee at that season of the year such self-restraint was heroic.

But, if man can thus rise superior to instinct, he can also descend below it. Once he goes down from the citadel of right reason in the matter of food and, especially, of drink, and enters on the unprotected, foggy plain of instinct, he courts the humiliation and disaster of the drunkard. There is no more pitiable object to contemplate than the man who discards or abuses his reason to become the slave of depraved instinct.

In the higher plain of reason, man's course is clearly marked out, in regard to the preservation of his life as well as in regard to all other matters of the natural order.

What is necessary in order to attain the end ordained by the Creator is not only permissible, but is a duty ; what is injurious or destructive of the end is sinful in proportion to the injury done ; what lies between necessity or usefulness on the one hand, and frustration or injury on the other, may be regarded as indifferent in itself, but may cease to be so, under certain circumstances and considerations.

Let us apply those principles to the question of Total Abstinence, as ordinarily understood. In the first place, alcohol, in any shape or form, is not necessary or even useful for bodily health. The highest medical teaching and practice to-day bears out this proposition, as well as universal experience. I know, of personal knowledge, that the best hospitals and practitioners have discarded alcohol for any purpose, even as a stimulant. And I have yet to meet the man who, after some experience of Total Abstinence, failed to proclaim that his health is much better, in every way, without than with alcohol. On the other hand, it is equally certain that alcoholic drink is injurious, more or less, to every constitution. When taken in large quantities and habitually it affects ruinously one or other of the vital organs ; it is thus the parent of countless diseases and the cause, remote or proximate, of countless premature deaths. Alcohol retards digestion ; it withers up, or else unduly dilates, the liver, thereby rendering that vital organ unfit to perform its part in the organism ; it rots and destroys the cells of the kidneys and is, in most cases, thought not always, the cause of Bright's and numerous other kidney diseases ; it over-stimulates the heart and wears it out prematurely ; it unduly excites the brain. 'All alcohol,' says Sir William Gull, 'injures the nerve tissue of the brain ; you may quicken the operations but you do not improve them.' And another eminent authority, Sir Henry Thompson, says, in like manner : 'Of all people I know who cannot stand alcohol, the brain-workers can do so least.'

I feel that it is needless for me to pursue this line of

argument in further detail before you, who are already well acquainted with it. Since it can be unhesitatingly asserted that the use of alcoholic drink is, on the one hand, unnecessary, and, on the other, more or less injurious to bodily health, it follows that the practice of Total Abstinence from it is reasonable and commendable in the purely natural order.

And if we ascend to the higher order of the supernatural, the sphere of faith and revelation, the arguments in favour of Total Abstinence become still stronger. St. Thomas teaches that the cardinal virtues may be considered as acquired, and also infused. Temperance, for instance, may be acquired by the exercise of the natural powers of man to the extent of reasonable restraint of the concupiscences of touch ; but it must be infused to attain the higher supernatural self-denial of that which nature would claim to be useful or, at least, harmless. It is in this higher order of temperance that Total Abstinence finds its proper place, and its best justification. Total Abstinence bears to temperance, considered in the special sense of sobriety in the use of drink, much the same relation that virginity bears to chastity, or the holy Religious state to ordinary Christian perfection. Total Abstinence from intoxicating drink is, undoubtedly, a form of perfection of sobriety, a species of self-denial, which is for all a useful, and may be, for some, a necessary factor in building up the fabric of Christian perfection, to which all men are called. In saying this, far be it from me to insinuate that a total abstainer, as such, is a morally superior person, or that a moderate consumer of alcoholic drink is necessarily lacking some element of even Christian perfection. The worst men I have ever known, whether in Church or State, were total abstainers ; and among the best men I have ever known were those who, day by day, took some alcoholic drink. I would go further and say that among those who were of the highest morality in other and far more difficult matters, as well as among the noblest characters I have ever met, were many of our race who, whilst heroic in other respects,

could not resist the occasional craving for strong drink, even to excess. This apparently anomalous fact was noticed seven centuries ago by a hostile but, in some respects, impartial writer, Giraldus Cambrensis, who remarked that our far-off predecessors drank like fishes but were pure as angels. This fact presents one of the many practical difficulties in dealing with the occasional violator of sobriety. It is in regard to them, especially, that the good old advice holds: 'Deal gently with the erring'; and it is with express reference to such failings that St. Augustine writes: 'Non aspere, quantum existimo, non dure, non imperiose ista tolluntur; sed magis docendo quam jubendo, magis monendo quam minando; sic enim agendum est cum multitudine peccantium; severitas autem exercenda est in peccata paucorum.'¹

But, withal, the practice of Total Abstinence is most salutary, from both the natural and supernatural point of view. The total abstainer is undoubtedly, *ceteris paribus*, a healthier and happier man than even the moderate drinker; he lives, if otherwise sound, in innocence of the complex operations of his bodily organs—stomach, liver, kidneys, heart, lungs, and brain; when fatigued he is not exposed to the foolish expedient of whipping up the beaten-out animal, but he gives it nature's rest and refreshment; thereby he prolongs life and activity, he is always fit for the duty of the hour. And in the higher region of reason, he has better control of all the inferior appetites and concupiscences; he is less prone to fits of anger and irritation, which are so frequently the outcome of an alcoholised liver; he is less a creature of impulse, or of heated imagination; his reasoning powers are steadier and clearer; his will is more constant and stronger, being guided and controlled by calm reason. In other words, Total Abstinence, in the natural order, helps, in a high degree, to restore man to the harmony and perfection of sense and spirit, in which he was originally created. The worth of Total Abstinence in the natural order was recognised by pagan philosophy. It has been

¹ Ep. ad Aurilium episcopum.

set forth, in his own inimitable way, by one of the greatest of thinkers, who, if not a Catholic, was, undoubtedly, the child of the Catholic ages, the myriad-minded Shakespeare, who puts into the mouth of one who is said to have been his favourite character, one of the few whom he himself personated, the old man, Adam, in 'As You Like It':—

Though I look old, yet I am strong and lusty :
 For in my youth I never did apply
 Hot and rebellious liquors to my blood :
 Nor did not with unabashful forehead woo
 The means of weakness and debility.¹

What a depth of meaning there is in these words ! Hot and rebellious liquors in the blood are, indeed, the poison of youth, the blight and curse of middle life, the shame and sorrow of old age. Hot and rebellious liquors in the blood are the fomentors of evil passions, the unabashful wooers of the means of weakness and debility. Hot and rebellious liquors in the blood are a constant menace to that citadel on the mountain-top wherein the Christian has to live out, in constant warfare, his supernatural life, in order to secure his eternal destiny.

And now, if we pass from the consideration, brief and imperfect, of Total Abstinence in relation to our individual well-being, to the consideration of it in relation to our duties towards others, notably in the sacred ministry, if we enter on this phase of the subject, we find ourselves on very broad and sound and prolific ground of argument. I do not intend to trespass much further on your already tried patience by dwelling on this phase at any great length, although, indeed, I regard it as by far the more important aspect of the question, as far as you are concerned.

The great philosopher of antiquity, the master of our own St. Thomas, and, as Dante rightly says, of all philosophers—'Il maestro di coloro che sanno'—Aristotle, in his immortal book of Ethics, says that the good of the many is more godlike than the good of the few.² And

¹ 'As You Like It,' II. 3.

² *Eth.* i. 2.

St. Augustine lays down in his book, *De Moribus Ecclesiae*, that the temperate man has regard not merely to the necessities of his own life but also to those of his duties—‘*Temperans respicit non solum necessitatem hujus vitae sed etiam officiorum.*’ And St. Thomas gives his high sanction to the same view. For, in arguing in favour of the licitness of drinking wine in moderation—which, of course, everybody must admit—he is careful to add that what is *in se* licit may become illicit under certain circumstances, or *per accidens*. Among these special reasons for Total Abstinence, in addition to the obvious ones of obligation by vow and of tendency to excess, he mentions expressly the edification of those who would otherwise be scandalised, and the special conditions obtaining with certain persons and certain localities. His exact words are: ‘*Bibere vinum, secundum se loquendo, non est illicitum; potest tamen reddi illicitum per accidens; quandoque autem ex parte aliorum qui ex hoc scandalizantur . . . Requiritur in aliquibus . . . quod omnino a vino abstineant, secundum condiciones quarundam personarum et locorum.*’¹

Now, I would maintain that the particular conditions prevailing in Ireland for long years past, and at the present hour, are clamouring for the exercise of this more perfect form of sobriety known as Total Abstinence, at least for a number of years, until the face of things, in this respect, is changed all over the land; until foolish and evil customs, traditions and opinions become radically altered. And I would go further and maintain that it is the duty—not a duty of justice nor of the sacred ministry as such, but a duty of charity, of higher pastoral zeal, of higher patriotism, for the Irish clergy, the unrivalled leaders of our people, to give an earnest, united lead in this all-important movement, and not rest satisfied until the bulk of their flocks are gathered within the safe fold of Total Abstinence.

In saying this, I must not be understood as asserting, or admitting for a moment that our people, as a whole,

are more given to the excessive use of alcoholic drink than other peoples in these raw northern climes, or that our clergy are less abstemious than those of other countries. I repudiate utterly the aspersions of this kind cast upon us by carping foe or candid friend. But, undoubtedly, there is in our race a certain temperament which incites to the use of alcohol and, in a corresponding manner, renders the use of intoxicating drink very attractive to us. We are a sensitive, nervous, imaginative, warm-hearted, generous, hospitable people; and all these qualities are so agreeably and insidiously stimulated by alcohol, that the use of it is easily carried to excess. The excessive use of strong drinks seems to be particularly deleterious to our race. I need not labour the point. Your own observation will have already convinced you of it; and the wider your experience will grow the more convinced you will be that there can be no true solid progress for our people until this arch-enemy is subdued. Our people, in every part of the country, seem to be ready and anxious to take up a new crusade against it. But they need leaders; not giant leaders, such as Peter the Hermit or Father Mathew, but numbers of wise, devoted, local leaders, acquainted with the special needs of each locality, devoting themselves to the training of small local units worthy to take a place in the great national phalanx of Temperance. Now, the only efficient leaders of a national movement of this kind are the diocesan clergy. There is no people on this earth so bound up with its clergy as the Irish people. It is sometimes tauntingly said that the Irish people are priest-ridden. Those who speak thus know nothing of the quasi-divine relations that exist between every priest of God's Church and the souls confided to his charge. Least of all do they realise the historic causes, the mutual sharing of the bread of bitterness in the past, which has welded priests and people in our land, as nowhere else in the world.

There is no country or race in which the priest of God is so markedly a *princeps populi sui*, as in holy Ireland, or among the Irish race, wherever it is spread. Where the

Irish priest leads his people will follow ; what has become a settled conviction with him will be easily accepted by them ; what he regards with indifference will never evoke enthusiasm in them ; what he frowns upon or discountenances, no power on earth can ever keep alive in them. These close bonds between priest and people, with us, are not merely of the supernatural order, they affect every relation of life. They are based not only on the Faith that Patrick taught, but on the struggles for bare existence which foreign conquest and ruthless persecution imposed. The people of Ireland lay absolutely helpless, especially after the siege of Limerick, with their lay leaders foolishly and cowardly gone, with all their property, rights, and liberties swept away, were it not for the inspiring courage and leadership of their priests. The priest alone, in those days of enforced darkness and enslavement, had the training which enabled him to baffle the tyrant's schemes, and the dauntless courage to smite his tyranny.

This high intellectual training, this fearless independence, the priest of those days imbibed in the best Universities of Spain, France, Italy, and the Netherlands. It was, we know, to sap this foreign cherished independence of the Irish priesthood that this College of Maynooth was founded. Thank God, that project failed, as we trust similar projects of even a more covert and insidious kind, nearer to our own day, will fail. Maynooth is a great example of the wisdom of taking what we can best get, and trusting to the genius, the Catholicity, the nationality of our people to mould it aright. In that giant conflict of the past thirty-five years, which has culminated in driving the robber from the soil of our fathers, and in winning back the right to govern ourselves, the priests of Ireland, all, practically, the *alumni* of Maynooth, bore a leading, conspicuous part. Without their leadership and active co-operation, the victories achieved would have been utterly impossible. Nor is there any fear that the Irish people will ever forget the part taken by their priests in this later and successful assault on feudalism and Castle government, no more

than they have forgotten the services rendered in the long night of the past. I, for one, have no patience with those who dangle before our eyes the bogie of anti-clericalism. As far as I know our race—and I have had occasion to observe and study it in various environments and aspects—I believe it will have to change not only its texture, but its very substance, before severing the ties of confidence and trust and affection that bind it to its priests. Another race will dwell in this land, a race of materialists, of soulless atheists, without memory, without feeling, the past will have been erased for ever, Maynooth will have been razed to the ground and effaced as utterly as the banquet hall of Tara, before any man or any party can successfully attack the citadel of priestly influence and guidance, even in temporal affairs, in holy Ireland. Nothing but the failure of the priests themselves to live up to the ideal of generous, faithful service handed down from the past could ever lead to such a disastrous issue.

That service, active, constant, unselfish, lies before us still, as in the days gone by. It may even be said that the new state of things which is arising will make still heavier demands upon our service to our people. With Home Rule established, we, Irish priests, must not retire to our tents, to our presbyteries and sacristies. That was the fatal mistake committed abroad. It has taken devoted service, shoulder to shoulder in the trenches, to restore the old-time confidence of the French in their clergy—a confidence never again, please God, to be impaired. It was the well-trained, active co-operation of the Belgian clergy that contributed so much to the marvellous industrious development of their now much-vexed country; and when the day of restoration comes, as come it will and soon, the priests of Belgium, secular and regular, will have allotted to them a chief part in the labour and in the recompense of a nation's revival from its ashes.

Here at home, in the near future, Irish priests will have cast upon them duties and responsibilities demanding even more zeal, more self-sacrifice than ever before. There is

immediately before us the building up and the furnishing of the temple of our nationhood. The foundations are, at last, laid. What we need now is safe scaffolding, steady workmen, and sound material. And the key to all these most pressing requisites is resolute sobriety, self-respect, self-control, which cannot be realised in present conditions, except through the more perfect, the more heroic form of Total Abstinence. 'Nisi Dominus aedificaverit domum in vanum laboraverunt qui aedificant eam.' The absolutely needed element in the new fabric of our nationhood will be perfect sobriety of thought and action; and no power, no organisation, can bring this to pass but the priesthood of Ireland.

JOHN T. MURPHY, C.S.SP.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

LAWS OF FAST AND ABSTINENCE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you please say whether : 1°. When permission is given for the use of meat on an ordinary day during Lent, those exempt by age from the fasting law may have meat as often as they please ? 2°. Whether, in case the general law allows such a privilege, the Bishop may curtail it ?

M. G. W.

1°. Those exempt by age may have meat as often as they please. We need quote no special authorities. All are agreed.

2°. But as the Bishop is free to refuse the privilege, so is he free to restrict it. He may grant it in full or in part, and his word is final.

FORMALITIES OF ENGLISH LAW

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you please say where I can find the civil regulations governing the marriage of Catholics with Christians of other denominations.

M.

The ordinary primers on English law will give 'M' the full civil regulations. But we think he will find all he needs in two letters contributed to the *I. E. RECORD*¹ by Mr. F. W. Doheny, John's Bridge, Kilkenny.

THE DEVOTION OF THE NINE FRIDAYS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly answer following queries in next issue of the *I. E. RECORD*, and oblige.

1°. Does the falling of the First Friday on Good Friday interrupt the consecutiveness of the Nine First Fridays ?

2°. Could the condition of consecutiveness be observed by receiving Holy Communion at or after 12 o'clock, noon, on Holy Thursday ?

P.P.

'P.P.' has given us a query that, we think, no human authority can answer. There is an indulgence attached to each separate

¹ See *I. E. RECORD*, vol. xxxi. pp. 425, 651 et seq.

Communion on a First Friday. That indulgence will certainly not be secured on the First Friday of April, seeing that, according to ecclesiastical regulations, Communion for the ordinary faithful is, on that particular day, quite out of the question.

But the query of 'P.P.' is a different one. Does the fact that the First Friday falls on Good Friday—when the faithful are not allowed to communicate—interfere with the 'consecutiveness' of the 'Nine First Fridays'?

The answer to the query depends on Christ's intention.

We may think, as we do, that it would be very unreasonable that the faithful, who had completed part of their 'Nine Fridays' devotion, should be compelled to begin again merely because, through no fault of theirs, the fulfilment in the technical sense became impossible. We may think, as again we do, that Communion on the day nearest to the First Friday—or, indeed, on the First Friday of the next month—would fulfil all the requirements of the indulgence and privilege. But we recognise that these are mere human speculations, and—however reasonable they may appear to us—may be very far from Christ's intention.

So, seeing how doubtful all this matter is, 'P.P.' will fall back on sound theological principles, and instruct his people accordingly. He will tell them to receive as near as possible to the First Friday of April. He will ask them, also, to receive on the First Friday of May. And when that is done, the mere fact that, on a certain date in April, 1915, the faithful were forbidden by Church law to communicate, will not, we think, prejudice their spiritual interests.

A CASE UNDER THE 'NE TEMERE' DECREE—LOSS OF QUASI-DOMICILE

REV. DEAR SIR,—May I ask you to advise me if I acted correctly in the following case? A has been a servant girl for three months in this parish. She wished to marry a soldier stationed at a neighbouring camp, and to have my leave for the marriage at the camp. She is a minor, and her parents have a domicile in another diocese. The camp in question is not in my diocese, nor is it in her parent's diocese. I warned A to retain her situation until after the marriage. Having obtained dispensation in banns I gave leave to the chaplain at the camp to perform the ceremony; he obtained the necessary dispensations in his own diocese. She called late last evening for all necessary papers from me; she was to be married to-day at 11 o'clock, and to leave this parish by an early train.

I found she had given up her situation as from this morning, but she was leaving her trunk to be called for. I required her to depute me to take a room in her name in my parish, and to return to same

after the marriage; she had actually left my parish before I engaged a room.

Had I lost my jurisdiction over her or not? In case she lost her domicile here did I do wrong in such urgent circumstances in acting as her parish priest and in giving leave for her marriage; and, if so, should I send small fee received by me to the parish priest of her parents' home?

X.

We are afraid our correspondent is confusing the *Ne Temere* regulations with those that held previously. In connexion with cases of this kind, it cannot be repeated too often that two very important changes have been made: 1° the quasi-domicile has ceased to have any importance, its place being taken by the month's residence; 2° when parishioners are married outside the boundaries of the parish, the parish priest is no longer entitled to act as official witness, or to commission anyone else to act in his name. In certain circumstances his permission will be required, but that only for lawfulness not for validity. The official witness is the parish priest of the place where the ceremony takes place—or, of course, his delegate¹ or the Ordinary.

The girl, we may take it, had only a quasi-domicile in 'X's' parish. Under the *Tametsi* decree it would have been all-important to see that she retained that quasi-domicile up to the time of the marriage. She would have done so until the two elements required for securing a quasi-domicile—actual residence and the intention of remaining the greater part of a year—had *both* ceased. If she had an understanding with her employer that, in case the marriage did not take place, she was free to return for service, her possession of the quasi-domicile would not be in any way affected. And the same would most probably be true in the circumstances described by 'X.' Whether the room had been engaged before her departure or not would not really matter. According to the best opinion, the domicile or quasi-domicile is attached, not to any particular house, but to the parish. Her residence with her employer had come to an end: so had her intention of remaining anywhere in the parish for more than six months: but the arrangements made for her return, even for a very short time, were sufficient to secure her continued connexion with, and residence in, the parish. She had not actually left the parish with the intention of not returning, and her quasi-domicile, therefore, remained.

But, under the *Ne Temere* all that is purely speculative. Whether she secured a quasi-domicile, or retained it, or lost it, has no bearing whatever on the parish priest's qualifications. The quasi-

¹ Using the term 'delegate' in the wider sense; there is really no question of jurisdiction.

domicile has been eliminated. If no domicile has been acquired—as we presume is true in the case before us—the important point is the month's residence. And, in estimating the month's residence, we should, we think, confine ourselves to objective facts and disregard the whole question of intention: it would only entail the very difficulties which the new decree was intended to obviate. If a woman has, immediately before her marriage, resided in a parish for a month, she is a parishioner in so far as matrimonial matters are concerned; nor would a short absence, even for the purpose of contracting marriage in another parish, interfere with her residence or with the rights of the parish priest.

It may be questioned, and it is, whether the month's residence, in addition to giving the parish priest the right to assist, entitles the Ordinary to grant matrimonial dispensations—from the proclamation of banns, for instance. Some are inclined to deny, on the principle that the decree says nothing of such extended faculties; others are of opinion that, since the Ordinary is entitled to assist, he is also entitled to take such steps as are necessary to make assistance possible. In view of this difference of opinion, and of the fact that, in the case submitted, the 'necessary dispensations' were obtained in both dioceses, we may take it that all ecclesiastical requirements were fully complied with.

The chief trouble, however, we think—though 'X' says nothing about it—is that the marriage may have been invalid. Army chaplains, generally speaking, have no faculties to assist at marriages. That was always the rule,¹ and the *Ne Temere*, as we know from a Roman declaration,² has made no change in the regulations. But here again, we think, we may presume that everything has been in order. The chaplain, we may take it, knew the prescriptions of the *Ne Temere* decree. If he assisted at the marriage, as he did, he had special faculties attached to his office, or he had delegation from the local parish priest. In either case he knew that his position as official witness was not due to the permission he had got from 'X.'

Taking the marriage, therefore, as valid, we have only to consider 'X's' position. On the basis of the month's residence he was one of the bride's parish priests—the other was the parish priest of her native parish—and did quite right in letting the chaplain have permission to assist at the marriage. Under the general law the fee would go to the clergy of the parish where the marriage took place: the Irish law, however, prescribes that, when the clergy

¹ Giraldi, *Exp. Jur. Pont.* ii. 115, n. xiii.; Decisions, 11th December, 1677; 6th and 20th March, 1694; 29th January, 1707; 4th December, 1723, etc.

² S.C.C. (*Acta S. Sedis*, xli. 108–111).

mentioned have got a 'reasonable' fee, the surplus goes to the parish priest of the bride.¹ The surplus in the present case is, we suppose, the 'small fee' to which 'X' refers. When there are several parish priests, the law says nothing about the division. Commentators differ; and we can add nothing to what we said in a previous number.² 'X' will weigh the different opinions and decide for himself whether part of the 'small fee' is to go elsewhere.

DELEGATION OF A CURATE IN A MATRIMONIAL CASE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly answer the following question in an early issue of the I. E. RECORD :—

A pair from parish A come to parish B to be married. In the absence of the parish priest of parish B the curate, himself having faculties, cannot sub-delegate. The parish priest of A performs the ceremonies of marriage, including the asking and receiving the consent of the parties, while the curate of B is present and looks on as a witness. The question is, would that marriage be valid?

PAROCHUS.

The principles quoted in the last reply will carry us near a solution of the query submitted by 'Parochus.' But we must add one more, namely, that, according to the provisions of the *Ne Temere* decree, the official witness must be invited (explicitly or implicitly), and must ask and receive the consent of the parties to the matrimonial contract. The mere passive assistance—often compulsory or involuntary—recognised by the old law is now quite insufficient.

The parish priest of A was acting outside his parish and, in matrimonial matters, had no authority whatever. He might have got authorisation from other sources, but—so far as the evidence goes—he did not get it. The curate of B was the only man he was brought into contact with, and the curate of B did not sub-delegate: in fact, according to the evidence submitted, he had no power to do anything of the kind.

The curate might have assisted, and everything then would have been quite in order. But, so far as we can see, he was neither invited, nor did he ask or receive the consent of the parties. The marriage, therefore, was invalid.

Priests trained under the old discipline may think this opinion strange. It is hard on the priests who took part—harder still on the parties directly concerned. But we are not concerned with a defence of the new law in all possible circumstances. We are only trying to explain, as far as we can, what the new law is.

¹ Resolution of the Irish Bishops, October 14, 1908.

² I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. iv., p. 629.

POWER OF THE PARISH PRIEST TO DELEGATE. EXCUSING
CAUSES FROM THE LAW OF BANNS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I shall be thankful for an answer to the following in the I. E. RECORD :—

1. May, or can, the parish priest delegate the curate 'to assist at all marriages which may turn up' during his absence on vacation, no particular cases mentioned?

2. In a diocese where from time immemorial the Banns have never been proclaimed (the personal investigation by the parish priest invariably being substituted) may one consider the dispensation sought in the circumstances—no cause is given or asked—as a merely formal proceeding, from which an ordinarily grave *incommodum* would excuse?

A journey of three miles afoot excuses from hearing Mass on Sundays; ought not a similar inconvenience excuse those whom diocesan custom compels to make a journey in person to the Vicar-Forane, so that the parish priest could perform the marriage ceremony without such dispensation?

SACERDOS.

1. The parish priest may delegate his curate to act in the way mentioned. And, though he is recommended not to use the faculty very extensively, still in the circumstances described his action would be quite justifiable.

2. Ecclesiastical laws are of varying importance, and excusing causes must be measured accordingly. What would excuse, for instance, from Sunday observance, would be quite insufficient to excuse from the Paschal precept. Considering the importance of the law of Banns—its purpose and the penalties—the inconvenience mentioned by our correspondent would not be sufficient to excuse.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

MASS 'PRO POPULO'

REV. DEAR SIR,—The well-known writer on liturgical subjects, Appeltern, at page 107, after stating *Episcopi ordinari* are bound to say Mass for their diocese, adds these words: 'Episcopus ordinarius qui officium parochi simul exercet hodie satisfacit obligationi qua tenetur applicatione unius Missae pro universo populo sibi commissio.' He gives no authority for his statement, and it is, as far as I know, contrary to the generally received opinion as well as to the declaration of the Holy See in the Dromore case.

Might I ask you to say whether Appeltern is right? From the use of the word *hodie* I am inclined to think that the statement referred to is an erroneous interpretation of a passage in the Constitution of Pope Leo XIII (*In Suprema*), June 10, 1882; to be found in the *Nouvelle Revue Theologique*, t. 14, p. 229.

INQUIRER.

The discipline of the Church on the point raised in our correspondent's letter has not always been the same. In 1779, in reply to the Bishop of Bari, the Congregation of the Propaganda issued the following declaration: 'Cum tu vices parochi in aliqua paroecia vacanti supplebis . . . satis erit ut in diebus determinatis celebres Missam pro tuis dioecesanis, inter quos includitur etiam paroecia cui per accidens adsistis.'¹ From this regulation canonists deduced that, whenever a Bishop ruled over a parish within his diocese, he satisfied his twofold obligation of offering sacrifice by the one Mass *pro populo*.² This teaching prevailed until 1863, when the Dromore decision, referred to by 'Inquirer,' was given. Amongst other questions put to the Congregation of the Propaganda on that occasion was the following:—

8. An episcopus Dromorensis qui parochi officium exercet, dum Missam pro suis dioecesanis applicat, suae satisfaciat obligationi, quae sibi ut parochio inhaeret?

The reply, given on March 23, 1863, was:—

Ad 8 . Juxta exposita negative et ad mentem. Mens est quod si episcopus nullum habet in civitate Newry vicarium, qui eam parochiam administret, teneatur eum ibi constituere, ac per eum ipsum debeat etiam satisfacere obligationi Missae pro populo, animadverso tamen quod ad normam § 4 Const. Benedicti XIV *Cum semper oblatas*, in praefinienda congrua ad illiusmodi onus habet respectum.³

¹ Coll. S. C. de Prop. Fid. n. 191.

² Vide Gasparri, *De Sanctissima Eucharistia*, vol. i. p. 365.

³ Coll. S. C. de Prop. Fid. n. 204.

Accordingly, the Bishop of Dromore, by celebrating a Mass for his diocese, did not satisfy his obligation in reference to the parish of Newry of which he retained the title ; he still remained bound to the second Mass *pro populo*.

Although given for the solution of a particular case, this reply is regarded by canonists as enunciating a principle of universal application, and, consequently, as constituting a universal law revoking the contrary dispositions of the decree already noticed.¹

The question now arises, has this discipline been again changed ? Appelter, in the passage quoted, in laying down the proposition that a Bishop, nowadays, satisfies the twofold obligation by a single Mass, implies clearly that it has. We cannot, however, agree with him. In the first place he can scarcely be basing his view upon any decree or decision of the Roman Congregations. If such were the case, a man like Appelter, usually so careful in giving his authorities, would be certain to quote it. Other modern writers, too, such as Gasparri,² Ojetti,³ Marc,⁴ D'Annibale,⁵ and Many⁶ are quite unaware of the existence of any such decree ; they all refer to the Dromore decision, and regard it as containing the existing discipline on this point. Besides, we ourselves have made a diligent search amongst the documents published in recent years by the Roman Curia, and have been unable to find anything which would give the slightest justification to this opinion.

Nor can Appelter's view have its foundation in general custom. It is certain that no such custom exists in this country. Neither can there be any evidence of it in the places with which the canonists above quoted were acquainted, otherwise they would be certain to have mentioned it.

It is hardly necessary, then, to add that we regard Appelter's opinion as without foundation, and that we still consider a Bishop who, besides his diocese, rules also over a parish, bound to apply a distinct Mass for each. We cannot say from what the view of

¹ Gasparri, l.c., p. 366.

² Loc. cit.

³ 'Episcopus autem qui simul cum episcopali exercet officium parochiale, non satisfacit applicando diebus festis unam tantum Missam pro populo.'—*Synopsis Rerum Moralium*, Ad verbum 'applicatio.'

⁴ 'Si episcopus officium parochi exerceat duplicem Missam applicare tenetur.'—*Th. Mor.*, vol. ii. n. 1606.

⁵ 'Verum hi qui sunt etiam parochi alicujus paroeciae in hac per vicarium applicare debent.'—*Summ. Th. Mor.*, vol. iii. n. 169, note 30.

⁶ *Prael. De Missa*, p. 166. Many, however, distinguishes between a Bishop administering a parish temporarily during its vacancy until the appointment of a new parish priest and a Bishop governing a parish perpetually as a parish priest. In the former case he holds that the Bishop would be bound to only one Mass, while in the latter he would be bound to two. We prefer Gasparri's view, which denies that there is a sufficient basis for a distinction between the two cases.

this distinguished rubricist has taken its origin. It may have arisen, as our correspondent suggests, from an erroneous interpretation of the Constitution *In Suprema*; or it may have been based upon some local custom with which its author was acquainted.

It may be just as well, in this place, to call attention to another error regarding the Mass *pro populo*, which we ourselves have noticed in Appeltern. Page 108 contains the following statement: 'Parochus qui plures forte paroecias regat, licet non aequè principaliter unitas, hodie unam tantum debet Missam pro populo diebus praescriptis applicare.' The first fault which we have to find with this proposition is the implication contained in the clause 'licet non aequè principaliter unitas.' The impression clearly conveyed by these words is that, if the union were 'aequè principalis,' no doubt could exist that it would be sufficient to apply one Mass, whatever might be said in regard to other forms of union. Now, this is altogether incorrect. All canonists with whose writings we are acquainted state definitely that, when the union which exists between parishes is a *unio extinctiva*, one Mass, indeed, suffices, but that when the union is of any other kind, one Mass must be said for each of the parishes thus united. We should not, then, object to the clause if it ran somewhat as follows: 'licet non unione extinctiva unitas'; but as it stands it conveys an altogether false impression.

But what is to be said of the main proposition that, nowadays, a parish priest who rules over two or more parishes, no matter what the nature of the union between them, satisfies his obligation of offering sacrifice by the one Mass *pro populo*. Well, in our opinion, it is only partially true. To understand in how far it is erroneous we must distinguish between three kinds of union which may exist between parishes which are thus presided over by one parish priest, viz., *unio extinctiva*, *unio minus principalis*, and *unio aequè principalis*. The union is *extinctiva* when the natures and titles of the parishes united are destroyed, and one completely new parish is formed, distinct altogether from the previous ones of which it is composed. It is *minus principalis* when the titles remain distinct, but at the same time one parish is subjected to the other. Finally, in union which is *aequè principalis* objectively the parishes remain not only distinct, but also independent—the union being entirely subjective and consisting in this, that the parishes are conferred upon the same individual.

Now, canonists without exception lay down the principle that, while in the first kind of union the incumbent satisfies his obligation by offering one Mass *pro populo*, in the latter two it is necessary to apply as many Masses as there are parishes united.

* This teaching is based upon frequently repeated decisions of the Roman Congregations which leave not the slightest room for doubt upon the point. We shall content ourselves with quoting a couple of them :—

An Parochi duabus parochialibus ecclesiis praepositi teneantur dominicis aliisque festis diebus Missam in unaquaque ecclesia sive per se sive per alium pro populo applicare in casu ?

Resp. Affirmative, exceptis tantum parocciis unitis unione plenaria et extinctiva.¹

I. Utrum parochi duas aut plures regentes paroccias ad duas vel plures Missas pro populo celebrandas in diebus festis teneantur per se aut per alios ?

Resp. Ad I. Parochum prout in casu teneri sive per se sive per alium ad tot Missas celebrandas quot paroccias regit.²

Many other decisions to the same effect could be also cited if it were necessary to do so.³

But, perhaps, some recent decree has been issued which has changed this long continued policy, and given the foundation for Appeltern's view. Well, Appeltern himself can scarcely be aware of the existence of any such decree, otherwise he would be certain to have quoted it. Nor have we ourselves been able to find any trace of its existence, either from a study of modern writers on this subject, or from an examination of the documents which have emanated in recent years from the Roman Curia. We have been further confirmed in our conclusion that no such decree really exists, and that the old teaching still holds the field, by the fact that the Editor of *Il Monitore Ecclesiastico*, writing on this question as recently as October last, has not the faintest suspicion that any new legislation regarding it has appeared.⁴

MAY OLD CHURCHES BE USED FOR PROFANE PURPOSES ?

REV. DEAR SIR,—A neighbouring parish priest and I are troubled as to what we are to do with two old churches in our parishes. They have become quite useless for religious purposes, and, as their upkeep is a serious drain on parochial funds, we are anxious to sell or let them. Would you be good enough to answer the following queries in the pages of the I. E. RECORD :—

1. May old churches, under these conditions, be used for profane purposes, and, if so, what religious ceremonies, if any, are prescribed when they are being divested of their sacred character and transformed into secular buildings ?

¹ S.C.C. in Lucena, 26 Feb. 1774.

² S.C.C. in Lancianen. et Ortonen., 3 Feb. 1884.

³ Vide S.C.C. in Salamantina, 22 Feb. 1862 ; in Divionen, 24 Julii 1886 ; S.C. de Prop. Fid., 26 Feb. 1875, etc.

⁴ *Il Monitore Ecclesiastico*, October, 1914, pp. 411 et seq.

2. In view of the principles laid down in your article on the alienation of Church property can we either sell or let them without permission from Rome ?

PRESBYTER.

1. The Council of Trent in Session XXI, chapter 7, *de Ref.*, dealing with those upon whom rested the obligation of restoring parochial and other churches, declared that, when, through lack of funds, it was impossible to repair them, the Bishop had the power to turn them over to profane uses, provided, however, these uses were not altogether unbecoming their former dignity.¹ With this slight restriction, then, these old churches may, with episcopal authority, be secularised.

To divest them of their sacred character no religious ceremony was prescribed by the Council of Trent, nor, as far as we are aware, at any subsequent period ; the mere declaration of the Bishop is quite sufficient. The only thing of this nature which is necessary is the erection of a cross in, or in front of, the buildings to keep in mind the sacred purpose to which they was formerly devoted.²

2. Apart altogether from the principles governing the alienation of ecclesiastical property we should consider it unlawful to sell these old churches without the permission of the Holy See. As already pointed out, permission is given to Bishops to excecrate them, only with the restriction that they be not used for purposes unbecoming their former sacred character. Now, if they were sold, no guarantee could be had that the uses to which they would be put would be always becoming, and consequently their sale would contain a virtual violation of the condition made by the Council of Trent. Whether or not the sale would be also forbidden by the laws against the alienation of ecclesiastical property depends upon the value of the churches, and whether they should be regarded as precious in the sense which we have described in last December's issue of the I. E. RECORD.³

If the churches were merely let, sufficient security could be always obtained that they would be decently employed, and hence the restriction of Trent places no necessary obstacle to this method of utilising them. The prohibitions against the alienation of ecclesiastical property, however, forbid not only alienation in the strict sense, but also letting for a longer period than three years.⁴

¹ 'Quod si nimia egestate omnes laborent, ad matrices seu viciniore ecclesias transferentur : cum facultate tam dictas parochiales quam alias ecclesias dirutas, in profanos usus non sordidos, erecta tam ibi cruce, convertendi.' —C. Trid., Sess. xxi, c. 7, *de Ref.*

² C. Trid., l.c.

³ I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. iv. pp. 637 et seq.

⁴ Bargilliat, *Inst. Juris Can.*, vol. ii. n. 971 ; Wernz, *Jus. Decret.*, tom. iii. n. 154, etc.

Consequently, if these churches are precious or of great value in the legal sense, they cannot be let for a period exceeding three years without having recourse to the Holy See. They may, however, be let for a lesser period with merely episcopal authority. Should they be not of great value, then, of course, episcopal authority is sufficient to let them for any period.

IMPRIMATUR FOR PRAYER BOOKS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly state in next issue of the I. E. RECORD if the two Constitutions, *Officiorum* and *Sollicita*, quoted in your December number, forbid a chaplain of the Sodality of the Children of Mary to have printed the Little Office of the Immaculate Conception, a few rules and regulations, the 'Reception Ceremony,' and a couple of pages of indulgenced prayers, without authorisation or *imprimatur*? This little manual is for local use only.

CAPELLANUS.

The manual described by our correspondent may, we think, be justly regarded as a *libellus precum*, and consequently its publication without *imprimatur* is forbidden in virtue of the 20th rule of the Constitution *Officiorum*. It seems, at first sight, superfluous to require authorisation to publish such a manual as the one mentioned, yet the reasonableness of this prescription will be fully appreciated when one considers the scope which would otherwise be given for the diffusion of false prayers and devotions. It should be noted, however, that it is not mere printing, but publication or dissemination amongst the public, that is forbidden; but in our opinion the practical adoption of this little manual by a local sodality is sufficient to verify the notion of publication intended by the decree.

THE 'CATHEDRATICUM'

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly answer the following questions, and oblige several priests :—

I. In a certain diocese of this province the parochial schools were made free by an increase of pew-rent in many of the parishes. When this was done the Bishop was notified by the pastors that the increase was not to be taken into consideration when the five per cent. *cathedraticum* was to be deducted from the ordinary gross receipts, and this was accepted as just by the Bishop then living. The new Bishop, however finding that he was entitled to five per cent. under the old rule refused to accede to the new arrangement and insists on the full amount as the basis of his *cathedraticum*. Is he entitled to this?

II. Another question in connection with this has arisen, and it is this: Has a Bishop the right to take any salary he wishes no matter how much it will amount to under such a rule?

B. M.

I. If we understand aright the case proposed to us for solution,

it is this : In a certain diocese of the province to which our correspondent belongs there is a general regulation to the effect that the amount of the *cathedraticum* to be paid by pastors is five *per cent.* of their gross income, or, at least, of their gross income from certain sources of which pew-rents is one. In certain parishes of this diocese some time ago the pew-rents were increased for the purpose of discharging debts on the parochial schools. When the debts, however, were paid, the increase was not remitted, but turned into the private revenue of the pastors. The Bishop then living took no account of this increase in calculating his five per cent. *cathedraticum*. Now, however, a new Bishop has come on the scene who insists that it shall be taken into consideration ; we are asked to give our opinion as to whether he is justified in so doing.

Well, it seems to us that the Bishop is quite justified in acting thus. So long as the general regulation of the five per cent. *cathedraticum* remains, we see no sufficient reason for exempting this portion of the pastor's income from its operation. The only plausible reason that can be urged is the action of the former Bishop in not urging his rights in the matter. But, even though we grant to the Bishop the power of changing the general regulation regarding the *cathedraticum*—and this power is not always possessed by him—we fail to see how the remission of his rights in particular cases can be regarded as such a change. And, granted even that the preceding Bishop had the power, and that *de facto* he introduced the change, then the present Bishop has just as much power to go back again to the old regulation.

To our mind the pastors have not very much of a grievance in the matter. The occupiers of the pews seem to us to have been the only people who were unfairly treated. When the rents were raised for a specific purpose, as soon as this purpose was accomplished it would seem most natural that they should be again lowered. If, instead of that, the increase became a source of income to the pastors, the latter have very little cause for complaint if they are compelled to pay a portion of it to the Bishop.

II. In a law of this kind by which a tax is imposed, one of the conditions for its justice is that a due proportion must exist between the amount of the tax and the cause of its imposition. In so far as this proportion is exceeded in so far is the law unjust. Manifestly a point could be reached at which a just ratio would no longer exist between a Bishop's revenue, as derived from the *cathedraticum*, and his reasonable needs, the cause on account of which this tax was imposed. By reasonable needs must be understood, however, not only those which are merely personal, but also

those which result from his position as administrator of the diocese. It is clearly impossible for us to determine when this point would be reached, as it depends for the most part not upon abstract principles applicable to the episcopal office in general, but upon the particular circumstances of each individual diocese which can be properly known only to those who are upon the spot.

The proper place for our correspondent to bring forward any grievances which he may have on this matter is the Diocesan Synod, as it is in this assembly that the amount of the *cathedraticum* has been fixed in very many of the dioceses of the country from which he hails.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

THE ORATIO IMPERATA 'PRO RE GRAVI'

OUR readers will remember the rather sweeping reduction made by the new rubrics in the number of days on which the *Oratio imperata* may be said. This Collect must now be omitted on doubles of the second class—even in a Low Mass; on all major Sundays; within the privileged octaves, and whenever more than three prayers are already obligatory in accordance with the rubrics for the day. But even the new legislation did not touch the case when the *Oratio imperata* was specially prescribed *pro re gravi*. When prescribed in this way the Collect had still to be said on feasts of the highest rite and on the most privileged days. At the time of the Vatican Council Pius IX ordered the prayer *De Spiritu Sancto* to be said in all Masses without exception; and the Congregation of Rites subsequently declared that a Bishop also may order a special Collect to be said even on doubles of the first class, provided the reason for doing so is sufficiently grave.¹

The decision as to what constitutes a *res gravis* in this connexion rests entirely with the Bishop. But one may safely say that, according to the spirit of the rubrics, a Collect *pro re gravi* should not be prescribed except in very urgent circumstances. For additional prayers of any kind are admitted only to the most limited extent on the great solemnities celebrated by the Church. And, as Gardellini notes,² in former times a Collect *pro re gravi*, even when ordered by the Pope, could not be said on doubles of the first class.

A partial return to this older legislation has been made by

¹ Aug. 7, 1875, Decr. 3365.

² *Suffragia super Decr.*, vol. iv. p. 189.

two answers of the Congregation of Rites which will be found among the Documents in the present issue (page 316 *infra*). Though thrown into the form of question and answer they are really special decrees, for the Congregation seems to have proposed the questions to itself.

A Bishop when he orders a Collect *pro re gravi* may also explicitly add that it is 'to be said on doubles of the first class'; or he may simply order it to be said *tamquam pro re gravi*, without any special direction that it is to be said on doubles of the first class. In the former case the Collect must, generally speaking, be said on doubles of the first class as heretofore. But the following days are excepted: Christmas Day, Epiphany, Holy Thursday, Holy Saturday, Easter Sunday, Ascension, Pentecost, and the feasts of the Trinity and Corpus Christi. In the latter case the Collect must be omitted on *all* doubles of the first class and also on Palm Sunday and the Vigils of Christmas and Pentecost.

At the present time the Collect *pro pace* has been ordered in most, if not all, of our dioceses, and some priests have arrived at the conclusion that it is to be governed by the rules regarding the *Oratio imperata* '*pro re gravi*,' even though the Bishop has prescribed it in the usual way. This conclusion we believe to be quite untenable. It will be noticed that in the answers of the Congregation to which attention has just been drawn the Collect *pro re gravi* is supposed to be said *only when the Bishop orders it as such* in one or other of two ways. No doubt the reason for which the Collect *pro pace* has been ordered is objectively a very grave one, and a Bishop might, if he wished, order it to be said *tamquam pro re gravi*. But the same thing may be said of many other reasons for which a Collect is ordered in the usual way; and if individual priests were to constitute themselves the judges of the 'gravity' of the reason, confusion and want of uniformity would be the result. It is the business of the Bishop to make known his will if he desires the Collect *pro pace*, or for any other object, to be said *tamquam pro re gravi*. And if he has ordered this or any other Collect in the ordinary way it should be taken for granted that he wishes the *ordinary* rules to be observed.

SCAPULAR MEDALS FOR THE ARMY AND NAVY

1. In the year 1912 a special concession was made in favour of those who, whether as soldiers or sailors, are engaged in active warfare. The scapular medal may be substituted for the various scapulars provided it has been blessed by a priest with the requisite faculties. Previous enrolment is not necessary, nor will enrolment be necessary afterwards.

2. A further concession has now been granted.¹ Any priest—no matter whether he has received faculties to invest in the scapulars or not, and even though he has not yet received approbation for hearing confessions—may validly and lawfully bless medals for those engaged in the present war. These special faculties hold good so long as the war continues.

THE EPISTLE AND GOSPEL IN THE REQUIEM MASS. MASS TO BE SAID FOR A DECEASED PRIEST 'IN DIE OBITUS SEU DEPOSITIONIS'

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be obliged if you would give answers in the I. E. RECORD to the following questions:—

I. Does the rubric, 'Epistolae et Evangelia superius posita in una missa pro defunctis, dici possunt etiam in alia missa similiter pro defunctis,' mean that any one of the Epistles and Gospels of the four *Missae pro defunctis* can be used at choice, no matter which of the four Masses is being said?

II. From the heading to the second Mass, viz., *In die obitus seu depositionis defuncti*, it would seem that this second Mass should be celebrated on the death or burial of a priest. Is there any decree either confirming or altering this rubric?

I. Although the rubric quoted is expressed in the most absolute and general terms it is clear from other rubrics as well as from decrees¹ of the Congregation of Rites that certain limitations must be admitted. The rubrics prefixed to the first and second of the *Orationes diversae pro defunctis* state that on the occasion of the death or anniversary of a Pope, and for a deceased Bishop, the first Mass, with the exception of the Prayer, must be said. Now, this implies that on such occasions the Epistle and Gospel must be taken from the first Mass, since, with the exception of the Epistle, Gospel, and Prayers, all the Masses are the same. What has been laid down for the death or anniversary of a deceased Pope or Bishop is true also, of course, of the third, seventh, and thirtieth days. These are the only clear exceptions which are specially mentioned in the rubrics or decrees.

But it is generally stated by writers on liturgy that the Epistle and Gospel of the first, second, and third Masses should be read as they stand in the missal on the days for which they have been specially appointed. These Epistles and Gospels are particularly appropriate, and were carefully selected for the occasions on which they are supposed to be said. It would be very incongruous, for instance, to substitute the Gospel of the *Missa quotidiana* on the

¹ See I. E. RECORD, February, 1915, p. 216.

² Decr. Auth. nn. 2578 ad 12; 3213 ad 5.

occasion of a funeral for the beautiful and suggestive Gospel of the Mass *In die obitus seu depositionis*. However, if a priest wishes to make the substitution there is no law to prevent him from doing so.

In the case of the *Missa quotidiana* a priest may freely, and often with the greatest propriety, take the Epistle and Gospel from another Mass.

II. It has been declared¹ by the Congregation of Rites that the first of the four requiem Masses may be said for a deceased priest *in die obitus*, with the special prayer *Pro defuncto Sacerdote*.

COMMUNION IN A NUN'S CELL A SHORT DISTANCE FROM THE ALTAR. WHERE SHOULD THE BOX FOR THE LUNETTE BE PLACED DURING EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT? BANNERS IN A PROCESSION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

REV. DEAR SIR,—May I ask the I. E. RECORD three short questions?

1. May the chaplain to a convent of nuns, giving Communion before Mass to the community, go beforehand, from the altar, in Mass vestments only, to communicate a sick nun outside the chapel, in a cell a few yards away?

2. During Exposition and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament where should the little custode, receptacle, or pyx that contains the lunette, be placed—*on* or *off* the corporal?

3. Is there any sort of approval anywhere existing for the practice prevailing in many churches of carrying banners in processions of the Blessed Sacrament?

1. We have not seen this precise question discussed by any author, nor can we find any decree which solves it directly. It has been decided,² however, that in the case of a hospital a priest may give Communion *intra missam* (and, therefore, in Mass vestments only) from a ciborium or pyx—but not from the paten³—to patients ‘etiam in aliquibus cubiculis ex quibus, etsi altare non videatur, tamen vox celebrantis auditur.’ We do not see any serious objection to applying the same principle to the case mentioned by our correspondent, seeing that the cell is only ‘a few yards away.’ In both cases the patient may be regarded as belonging, morally speaking, to the congregation.

2. In ordinary cases of Exposition and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament the box for the lunette is left *on* the corporal. But if the Exposition is to last for a considerable time, the box should be put into the tabernacle.⁴

¹ Decr. 2417 ad 8.

² Decr. Auth. 3322.

³ Ibid. n. 3099.

⁴ Van der Stappen, vol. iv. Q. 181 2º.

3. The custom of carrying banners of a religious kind is expressly allowed by the ritual¹: 'Praeferatur crux, et ubi fuerit consuetudo, vexillum sacris imaginibus insignitum, non tamen factum militari seu triangulari forma.' No exception is made which would exclude *banners* from a procession of the Blessed Sacrament, although statues or relics of the Blessed Virgin or the Saints must not be carried in such a procession.²

PURIFICATION OF THE CIBORIUM IN PECULIAR CIRCUMSTANCES. BLESSING OF HOLY WATER AND 'ASPERGES' AT VILLAGE STATIONS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I. In the principal church of this parish the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. There is only one ciborium for all purposes. As we do not know the number of communicants on Sunday we have to consecrate a large number of particles, and we do so on the corporal. We distribute first those contained in the ciborium, which is in the tabernacle, and we then continue with the freshly-consecrated ones. As the ciborium ought to be purified weekly, and as this ought to be done before the newly-consecrated hosts are put in, and as, moreover, there is a second Mass in the church, how is it to be done? Is it lawful to purify it into the chalice exhausted as far as may be and reserved for use at the second Mass? As I have said, there is only one sacred vessel in the tabernacle; the pyx is not kept there, but is kept in the oratory at the presbytery, at some distance from the parochial church. The priest does not think it necessary to bring it with him on Sunday, or at all events he does not do so.

II. At the public stations, held throughout the South and West of Ireland, holy water is always blessed for the use of the people. The following is the usual method of procedure. The priest at the left hand side of the altar vests in all the sacred vestments, except the maniple and chasuble. He then proceeds to the right hand, or Epistle side, where from the missal he goes through the usual ceremony of exorcism, etc., and continues up to the last prayer. He then, from among the *Benedictiones diversae* reads the *VV.*, *RR.* and prayer *Benedictio loci*. He then sprinkles the altar and people, repeating the *Asperges me*, etc., with Psalm and *Gloria*. He afterwards returns to the altar, and continues the *VV.*, *RR.*, and prayer *Exaudi nos*. When he has finished this prayer he returns to the Gospel side, finishes the vesting and then proceeds with the Mass. Would you kindly inform your readers whether this mode of procedure is in accordance with the rubrics, or is there anything unrubrical and, therefore, reprehensible in it?

CURATE.

[I. We need hardly say that if a case like this is liable to occur frequently a second ciborium should be provided for the church. Another suggestion would be to purify the ciborium on some day during the week, and to have it full for the Communion on Sunday. The Blessed Sacrament would meantime be kept in the pyx. If,

¹ Tit. ix. c. I, *De Processionibus*, n. 5.

² Decr. 3997.

however, additional particles must be consecrated on the corporal, the priest might well bring a pyx, containing no consecrated hosts, into which he could purify the ciborium by the dry method, and in which he might also put any fragments which will remain on the corporal after the newly-consecrated hosts have been placed in the purified ciborium. The pyx could afterwards be purified on a week-day in the ordinary way.

All this, however, leaves untouched the difficulty submitted by our correspondent. He supposes that there is no sacred vessel into which the fragments from the ciborium and corporal can be put, except the unpurified chalice which has to be used for the second Mass. We think that the least desirable mode of procedure is to purify the ciborium into such a chalice. A large number of fragments would then be found in the chalice when the wine is poured in for the second Mass. This we consider to be quite wrong, whether one holds that such fragments contain the Real Presence or not. It may be said, of course, that a small portion of the consecrated species of wine must necessarily remain in the chalice. That, however, is a case of necessity, and there are other ways of dealing with the fragments contained in the ciborium and on the corporal.

What, then, is to be done? The priest may first distribute the hosts contained in the ciborium, and afterwards as many as are required of those on the corporal. The remaining hosts, as well as the fragments which may be found on the corporal, are then put into the unpurified ciborium. Or the priest may first distribute the hosts on the corporal and afterwards put the fragments into the ciborium. It is evident that neither solution is all that could be desired. There is in any case a mingling of *fragments*. But newly-consecrated *hosts* are not mingled with those previously consecrated. And as the ciborium can be purified early in the week, the mingling of fragments or even of hosts does not matter very much.

II. Holy water may be blessed, for a sufficient reason, at any time or in any place. It is quite correct also to give the *Benedictio loci* when Mass is said in an ordinary private house. The blessing of the holy water, then, and the *Benedictio loci* are in accordance with the rubrics, and the priest is properly vested for these functions. After the *Benedictio loci* has been read the place is sprinkled with holy water in accordance with the direction given in the missal. But no form of words is *necessary*. If, however, the priest wishes to sprinkle the people also, using the form *Asperges me*, etc., and saying the prayer *Exaudi* afterwards, there is no regulation, as far as we know, to prevent him from doing so.

**COLOUR OF THE COPE WHEN BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED
SACRAMENT IS GIVEN AFTER MASS**

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly let me know through the I. E. RECORD if the white cope must be used when Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is allowed to be given after Mass, even if the colour of the vestments for the day was red?

A SUBSCRIBER.

If the Benediction is given *immediately* after Mass the celebrant may assume a cope of the same colour as that of the vestments of the day. But if there is any appreciable interval, as when, for instance, the celebrant retires to the sacristy, the cope must be white. In all cases, however, the humeral veil must be white, or its equivalent.¹

‘ORDO’ DIFFICULTIES

REV. DEAR SIR,—May I ask the favour of a solution of the following difficulties in the rubrics:—

(a) In the Office of the fourth Sunday after the Epiphany, anticipated this year on Saturday, the *Ordo* prescribed the *Te Deum*; yet in the *Ordinarium* of the new Psalter the rubric of the *Te Deum* says: ‘*Alio tempore nunquam dicitur in feriali officio ETIAMSI DE ANTICIPATA DOMINICA FUERIT.*’ Why, then, had we to say it this year?

(b) On the first of February the *Ordo* gives a choice of the Mass of St. Brigid, of whom the Office is said, or of the Mass of St. Ignatius, of whom a commemoration only is made. Why is the choice allowed, and what is the extent of the choice according to the rubric?

An early reply in the I. E. RECORD would oblige.

JOHN.

(a) Because the rubric quoted by John has been changed since the publication of the regulations issued with the *Motu Proprio*, *Abhinc duos annos* in October, 1913. According to the new rubric² the *Te Deum* is said: *in omnibus Dominicis per annum minoribus, etiam anticipatis aut repositis.* The reason for the change will be found in the following words³ of the regulations referred to: ‘*Officium vero Dominicae quae post Epiphaniam, superveniente Septuagesima, vel post Pentecosten, superveniente Dominica xxiv, anticipari debet, celebretur in Sabbato praecedenti ritu semiduplici.*’ Such an Office was formerly celebrated as a simple. It is now a semidouble with nine lessons and, of course, the *Te Deum* is then to be said after the ninth lesson.

(b) The solution of our correspondent’s second difficulty will be found in the January (1915) issue of the I. E. RECORD (p. 82, iv. *De Translatione festorum*).

THOMAS O’DOHERTY.

¹ Van der Stappen, vol. iii. Q. 133, 2^o.

² Vide New Breviary, Autumn and Winter quarters.

³ Vide I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. ii. pp. 657 et seq.

DOCUMENTS

DOUBTS CONCERNING THE MASS, 'PRO POPULO'

(December 16, 1914)

[It is asked whether in view of recent changes in the celebration of certain Feasts the obligation of applying the Mass *pro populo* remains unchanged on specified days, and the answer of the Sacred Congregation is explicit.]

S. CONGREGATIO CONCILII

PAPIEN.

CIRCA MISSAM PRO POPULO

DUBIA

Ordinarius Papiensis haec dubia de Missa pro populo applicanda, ad sacram Congregationem Concilii pro opportuna solutione detulit, nimirum :

I. Utrum, post immutationes definitive nuper in festorum quorundam celebratione inductas, obligatio pro parochis adhuc maneat applicandi missam pro populo sequentibus diebus : die 19 martii in festo S. Iosephi, feria iv ante dominicam tertiam post Pascha in festo Patrocinii eiusdem S. Iosephi, feria quinta post dominicam primam post Pentecosten in festo Ss^{mi} Corporis Christi, et die 24 iunii in festo S. Ioannis Baptistae ?

II. Utrum, quum in dioecesi Papiensi festum S. Bartholomaei Ap., ob perpetuum impedimentum ex festo Dedicationis ecclesiae cathedralis die 24 augusti occurrente, perpetuo, tamquam in sedem propriam, in posteram diem 25 augusti fuerit translatum, missa pro populo hac ipsa die applicari debeat, an potius die 24 augusti ?

III. Utrum, attento quod in Papiensi dioecesi, diebus festis suppressis, missa pro populo celebranda, ex apostolico indulto, ad mentem episcopi applicatur, tolerari possit quod parochi, non ipsa die qua tenerentur, neque per se, sed per alium sacerdotem, missam ut praefertur applicandam celebrent ?

Et sacra eadem Congregatio, die 16 decembris 1914, ad proposita dubia rescripsit :

Ad I. Affirmative, excepta feria iv ante dominicam tertiam post Pascha, que festum Patrocinii S. Iosephi celebratur.

Ad II. Missam pro populo, in casu, celebrandam esse die 25 augusti.

Ad III. Affirmative.

O. GIORGI, *Secretarius*.

DOUBTS REGARDING A COLLECT 'PRO RE GRAVI' PRESCRIBED BY A BISHOP

(December 23, 1914)

[Assuming that a Bishop can order a collect *pro re gravi* to be said even on doubles of First Class it is asked (1) whether in such a case it should be said on all doubles of First Class; (2) on what days may the collect be omitted when the order contains no mention of doubles of First Class? Both questions are answered by the Congregation of Rites.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

DE COLLECTA PRO RE GRAVI IMPERATA

DUBIA

Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sequentia dubia, pro opportuna solutione, nuper proposita sunt; nimirum:

Ex decreto S. R. C., n. 3365, *Clodien*. 7 augusti 1875, ad II, episcopus potest praecipere, ut collecta *pro re gravi*, si revera sit *pro re gravi*, dicatur etiam in duplicibus primae classis; quaeritur:

I. Quando episcopus praescribit collectam *pro re gravi* etiam in duplicibus primae classis, collecta dicendane erit in omnibus et singulis duplicibus primae classis?

II. Si episcopus collectam *pro re gravi* simpliciter praecipiat absque ulla mentione duplicium primae classis, quibus diebus collecta omittenda erit?

Et sacra eadem Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, re sedulo perpensa, propositis quaestionibus ita respondendum censuit:

Ad I. Affirmative, exceptis sequentibus diebus; nempe: Nativitas Domini—Epiphania Domini—Feria V in Coena Domini—Sabbatum Sanctum—Pascha Resurrectionis—Ascensio Domini—Pentecostes—Festum Ssmae Trinitatis et Festum Ssni Corporis Christi

Ad II. In omnibus duplicibus primae classis, in vigiliis Nativitatis Domini et Pentecostes, et in Dominica Palmarum.

Atque ita rescipit ac servari mandavit, die 23 decembris 1914.

SCIPIO CARD. TECCHI, *Pro-Praefectus*.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, Ep. Charyst., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

**RENEWAL BY POPE BENEDICT XV OF APOSTOLIC INDULGENCES
ATTACHED TO ROSARIES, CROSSES, CRUCIFIXES, LITTLE
STATUES AND MEDALS, AND THE CONDITIONS OF ATTAIN-
ING THEM**

(September 5, 1914)

SUPREMA S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

INDULGENTIAE

QUAS SSMUS D. N. BENEDICTUS PP. XV IMPERTITUR CHRISTIFIDELIBUS,
QUI RETINENTES ALIQUAM EX CORONIS, ROSARIIS, CRUCIBUS,
CRUCIFIXIS, PARVIS STATUIS, NUMISMATIBUS, AB EADEM SANCTI-
TATE SUA BENEDICTIS, PRAESCRIPTA PIA OPERA ADIMPLEVERINT.

Monita.

Ut quis valeat Indulgentias lucrari, quas Summus Pontifex Benedictus XV impertitur omnibus utriusque sexus Christifidelibus, qui retinent aliquam ex coronis, rosariis, crucibus, crucifixis, parvis statuis ac numismatibus ab eadem Sanctitate Sua benedictis. requiritur :

1. Ut Christifideles in propria deferant persona aliquod ex enunciatis obiectis.

2. Quod si id minime fiat, requiritur ut illud in proprio cubiculo, vel alio decenti loco suae habitationis retineant, et coram eo devote praescriptas preces recitent.

3. Excluduntur ab apostolicae benedictionis concessione imagines typis exaratae, depictae, itemque cruces, crucifixi, parvae statucae et numismata ex stanno, plumbo, aliave ex materia fragili seu consumptibili confecta.

4. Imagines repraesentare debent Sanctos, qui vel iam consueta forma canonizati, vel in martyrologiis rite probatis descripti fuerint.

Indulgentiae.

Hisce praehabitis, recensentur Indulgentiae, quae ex Summi Pontificis concessione ab eo acquiri possunt, qui aliquod ex supradictis obiectis retinet, et pia opera quae ad eas assequendas impleri debent :

Quisquis saltem in hebdomada semel recitaverit coronam Dominicam vel aliquam ex coronis B. V. Mariae aut rosarium eiusve tertiam partem aut divinum officium, vel officium parvum eiusdem B. Virginis aut fidelium defunctorum, aut septem psalmos poenitentiales aut graduales, vel consueverit catechesim christianam tradere, aut carceribus detentos, vel aegrotos in nosocomiis misericorditer invisere, vel pauperibus opitulari, aut Missae interesse

eamve peragere si fuerit sacerdos : quisquis haec fecerit vere contritus, et peccata sua confessus ad S. Synaxim accedet quolibet ex infrascriptis diebus, nempe Nativitatis Dominicae, Epiphaniae, Resurrectionis, Ascensionis, Pentecostes, itemque diebus festis Ssm̃ae Trinitatis, Corporis Domini, Purificationis, Annuntiationis, Assumptionis, Nativitatis et Conceptionis B. V. Mariae, Nativitatis S. Ioannis Baptistae, S. Iosephi Sponsi eiusdem B. Mariae, Assumptionis, Nativitatis et Conceptionis B. V. Mariae, Nativitatis S. Ioannis Baptistae, S. Iosephi Sponsi eiusdem B. Mariae Virginis, Ss. Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, Andreae, Iacobi, Ioannis, Thomae, Philippi et Iacobi, Bartholomaei, Matthaei, Simonis et Iudae, Matthiae, et Omnium Sanctorum ; eodemque die devote Deum exoraverit pro haeresum et schismatum extirpatione, catholicae fidei incremento, pace et concordia inter principes christianos, aliisque sanctae Ecclesiae necessitatibus ; quolibet dictorum dierum Plenariam Indulgentiam lucrabitur.

Quisquis vero, corde saltem contritus, haec omnia peregerit in aliis festis Domini et B. V. Mariae quolibet dictorum dierum Indulgentiam septem annorum totidemque quadragenarum acquirat : quavis Dominica vel alio anni festo Indulgentiam quinque annorum totidemque quadragenarum lucrabitur : sin autem eadem alio quocumque anni die expleverit, centum dierum Indulgentiam acquirat.

Praeterea, quisquis consueverit semel saltem in hebdomada recitare aliquam ex coronis aut rosarium, vel officium parvum B. Mariae Virginis, vel fidelium defunctorum, aut vesperas, aut nocturnum saltem cum laudibus, aut septem psalmos poenitentiales cum litanis adiectisque precibus, quoties id peregerit centum dierum Indulgentiam consequetur.

Quisquis in mortis articulo constitutus animam suam devote Deo commendaverit, atque iuxta instructionem fel. rec. Benedicti XIV in Constitut. quae incipit *Pia Mater* sub die 5 aprilis 1747, paratus sit obsequenti animo a Deo mortem opperiri, vere poenitens, confessus et S. Communionem refectus, et si id nequiverit, saltem contritus, invocaverit corde, si labiis impeditus fuerit, Ssm̃um Nomen Iesu, Plenariam Indulgentiam assequetur.

Quisquis praemiserit qualemcumque orationem praeparationi Missae vel sanctae Communionis, aut recitationi divini officii, vel officii parvi B. V. Mariae, toties quinquaginta dierum Indulgentiam acquirat.

Quisquis in carcere detentos aut aegrotantes in nosocomiis inviserit, iisque opitulatus fuerit, vel in Ecclesia christianam catechesim tradiderit, aut domi illam suos filios, propinquos et famulos docuerit, toties biscentum dierum Indulgentiam lucrabitur.

Quisquis ad aeris campani signum, mane vel meridie aut vespere

solitas preces, nempe *Angelus Domini*, aut eas ignorans recitaverit *Pater noster* et *Ave Maria*, vel pariter sub primam noctis horam, edito pro defunctorum suffragio campanae signo, dixerit psalmum *De profundis*, aut illam nesciens recitaverit *Pater noster* et *Ave Maria*, centum dierum Indulgentiam acquirat.

Eandem pariter consequatur Indulgentiam, qui feria sexta devote cogitaverit de passione ac morte Domini nostri Iesu Christi, terque Orationem Dominicam et Salutationem Angelicam recitaverit.

Is qui suam examinaverit conscientiam, et quem sincere poenituerit peccatorum suorum cum proposito illa emendandi, devoteque ter recitaverit *Pater noster* et *Ave Maria* in honorem Ss^mae Trinitatis, aut in memoriam Quinque Vulnerum D. N. Iesu Christi quinque pronuntiaverit *Pater noster* et *Ave Maria*, centum dierum Indulgentiam acquirat.

Quisquis devote pro fidelibus oraverit, qui sunt in transitu vitae, vel saltem pro iis dixerit *Pater noster* et *Ave Maria*, quinquaginta dierum Indulgentiam consequatur.

Omnes Indulgentiae superius expositae a singulis Christifidelibus vel pro seipsis lucriferi possunt, vel in animarum Purgatorii levamen applicari.

Expresse declarari voluit Summus Pontifex, supradictarum Indulgentiarum concessione, nullatenus derogari Indulgentiis a praedecessoribus Suis iam concessis pro quibusdam operibus piis superius recensitis; quas quidem Indulgentias voluit omnes in suo robore plene manere.

Iubet deinde idem Summus Pontifex, Indulgentias Christifidelibus concessas, qui retinent aliquod ex praedictis obiectis, iuxta decretum s. m. Alexandri VII editum die 6 februarii 1657, non transire personam illorum pro quibus benedicta fuerint, vel illorum quibus ab iis prima vice fuerint distributa: et si fuerit amissum vel deperditum unum alterumve ex iisdem obiectis, nequire ei subrogari aliud ad libitum, minime obstantibus quibusvis privilegiis et concessionibus in contrarium: nec posse pariter commodari vel precario aliis tradi ad hoc ut Indulgentiam communicent, secus eandem Indulgentiam amittent: itemque recensita obiecta benedicta, vix dum pontificiam benedictionem receperint, nequire venundari, iuxta decretum S. C. Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis tuendis praepositae editum die 5 iunii 1721.

Praeterea, idem Summus Pontifex confirmat decretum s. m. Benedicti XIV editum die 19 augusti 1752, quo expresse declaratur, vi benedictionis crucifixis, numismatibus etc. uti supra impertitae, non intelligi privilegio gaudere altaria ubi huiusmodi obiecta collocata fuerint, neque pariter Missas quas sacerdos eadem secum deferens celebraverit.

Insuper vetat, ne qui morientibus adsistunt benedictionem cum Indulgentia Plenaria in articulo mortis iisdem impertiantur cum huiusmodi crucifixis, absque peculiari facultate in scriptis obtenta, cum satis in id provisum fuerit ab eodem Pontifice Benedicto XIV in praecitata Constitut. *Pia Mater*.

Tandem Sanctitas Sua vult et praecipit, praesentem elenchum Indulgentiarum pro maiori fidelium commodo edi typis posse non solum latina lingua vel italica, sed alio quocumque idiomate, ita tamen ut por quolibet elencho, qui ubicumque et quovis idiomate edatur, adsit approbatio S. Congregationis S. Officii.

Non obstantibus quolibet decreto, constitutione aut dispositione in contrarium etiamsi speciali mentione dignis.

Datum Romae ex Aedibus S. Officii, die 5 septembris 1914.

L. ✠ S.

✠ DONATUS, Archiep. Ephesinus, *Adsector S.O.*

CERTAIN PRAYERS 'TEMPORE CALAMITATIS' ARE ENRICHED WITH AN INCREASED INDULGENCE

(August 12, 1914)

SUPREMA S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECRETUM

AUGETUR INDULGENTIA RECITANTIBUS QUASDAM ORATIONES
TEMPORE CALAMITATIS

Ex audientia Ssmi, die 12 augusti 1914

Ssmus D. N. D. Pius div. prov. Pp. X, ut magis excitentur fideles ad Deum calamitosis temporibus propitium reddendum, loco indulgentiae sexaginta dierum concessae a s. m. Gregorio Pp. XVI, die 21 augusti 1837 universis Christifidelibus recitantibus orationes, quae sub titulo *Orazioni in tempo di calamita*, n. 332, in authentica Sylloge Indulgentiarum, a S. C. Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, die 23 iulii 1898, approbata, exhibetur, trecentorum dierum indulgentiam benigne clargitus est. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione.

Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

De mandato D. Card. Secretarii

L. ✠ S.

✠ DONATUS, Archiep. Ephesinus, *Adsector, S.O.*

**INDULT REGARDING THE INDULGENCES GRANTED TO
SODALITIES INSTITUTED TO PROMOTE THE READING OF
THE GOSPEL**

(November 26, 1914)

[The indulgences referred to were granted in a Decree, April 23, 1914 (vide I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. iv. p. 213). The new Decree states that in order to gain the indulgences it suffices (1) to have one's name enrolled in any such sodality canonically erected; (2) and to make the prescribed visits to any church or public oratory.]

SUPREMA S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECRETUM

**SEU DECLARATIO ET INDULTUM CIRCA INDULGENTIAS SODALITATIBUS
LECTIONI S. EVANGELII PROVEHENDAE CONCESSAS**

Die 26 novembris 1914

Ss̃mus D. N. D. Benedictus div. Prov. Pp. XV, in audientia R. P. D. Adessori S. Officii impertita, precibus Ẽm̃i ac Reṽm̃i domini Petri Cardinalis Maffibeni gne annuens, declarare dignatus est, ad lucrandas Indulgentias sodalitatibus lectioni S. Evangelii provehendae, a s. m. Pio Pp. X die 23 aprilis currentis anni tributas, non esse necessarium ut fideles adscribantur sodalitie existenti in loco vel dioecesi in qua degunt, sed sufficere ut dent nomen cui-cumque libuerit, ex iis quae canonice a Reṽm̃is Ordinariis erectae sunt. Quo vero facilius valeant sodales Indulgentiarum participes fieri, clementer indulsit ut visitatio praescripta in ecclesiis seu sacellis, quae ad sodalitates eiusmodi pertineant, peragi possi in qualibet ecclesia vel publico oratorio: salvo iure eorum, qui vitam communem agunt, iuxta Decretum huius S. Congregationis, d. d. 14 ianuarii 1909. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretarius.*

L. ✠ S.

✠ DONATUS, Archiep. Ephesin., *Adessor.*

**'MOTU PROPRIO' OF BENEDICT XV CONCERNING THE PONTI-
FICAL COMMISSION FOR THE REVISION OF THE VULGATE**

(November 23, 1914)

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV

MOTU PROPRIO

**DE PONTIFICIA COMMISSIONE VULGATAE VERSIONI BIBLIORUM
EMENDANDAE**

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Consilium a Decessore Nostro sanctae memoriae initum latinae Bibliorum versionis, quae vulgata dicitur, ad pristinam lectionem

restituendae nemo non numeraverit in iis rebus, quibus Pii X nomen immortalitati commendatur. Etenim, propter varietatem praesertim et copiam Codicum, qui toto orbe terrarum pervestigandi sunt et conferendi, de incepto agitur prope immensi operis et laboris; quod quidem peragi unius, quantumvis operosi peritique viri, industria non potest, sed plurium doctorum hominum communia eaque diuturna studia desiderat. Id vero, si e sententia evenierit, neque exiguas utilitates afferet Ecclesiae, et apud acatholicos de cleri catholici eruditione ac doctrina opinionem augebit.

De successu rei non equidem dubitamus, videntes quibus eam Decessor commiserit: probe enim cognita meritisque celebrata laudibus est sodalium Benedictinorum in hoc studiorum genere sollertia. Itaque *Commissionem* Vulgatae Bibliorum versioni emendandae, ut constituta est, confirmamus, Pontificiae appellationis honore ornamus, atque sui iuris iubemus esse his legibus:

I. Quoties Commissioni novus Praeses dandus erit, Abbas Primas foederatarum Benedictini Ordinis Congregationum, suis adessoribus consultis, unum pluresque proponet Summo Pontifici, qui, quem maluerit, huic muneri praeficiet.

II. Commissio corpus esto legitimum suique iuris, aequae ac cetera Benedictina coenobia.

III. Praeses in sodales, qui de Commissionem sunt, quamdiu sunt, eandem iurisdictionem habeat, quam quisque Abbas Benedictinus in sui coenobii monachos, salva, tamquam in radice, proprii Praelati potestate.

IV. Commissio ipsa suos sodales cooptet; huic tamen cooptationi intercedere, id est eam impedire, gravi de causa, Primati liceat. Optandum est autem, ut omnes Benedictinae Confoederationis Abbates, nisi locorum rationes obstiterint, libenter sinant eos qui in Commissionem adscribantur, hoc tantum tamque utile negotium obire.

V. Bona, quaecumque Commissioni obvenerint, ipse Praeses administret, nonnullis e Commissionem in consilium adhibitis; administrationis vero quotannis rationem Summo Pontifici reddet.

Atque haec Nos Motu-proprio statuimus, sancimus, contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XXIII mensis novembris MCMXIV, Pontificatus Nostri anno primo.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

THE SPIRITUAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE GRAECO-RUTHENIAN
CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA

(August 17, 1914)

S. CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

PRO NEGOTIIS RITUS ORIENTALIS

DECRETUM

DE SPIRITUALI ADMINISTRATIONE ECCLESIAE GRAECO-RUTHENAE IN
FOEDERATIS CIVITATIBUS AMERICAЕ SEPTENTRIONALIS

Cum Episcopo Graeco-Rutheno Statuum Foederatorum anno 1912 ab Apostolica Sede data fuerit plena et ordinaria iurisdictio in clerum et populum universum Graeco-Rutheni ritus in Foederatis Civitatibus Americae Septentrionalis permanentes sive ad tempus commorantes, eminentissimis ac reverendissimis Patribus Cardinalibus S. Congregationi de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis Rituum Orientalium praepositis, in plenariis comitiis die 10 augusti huius anni habitis, opportunas, quae sequuntur, visum est condere leges circa spiritualem administrationem Ecclesiae Graeco-Ruthenae in praedicta regione.

CAPUT I.

De Episcopo Graeco-Rutheni ritus

Art. 1. Nominatio Episcopi Graeco-Rutheni ritus pro regione Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis Apostolicae Sedi reservata est.

Art. 2. Episcopus Graeco-Rutheni ritus eiusque legitimi successores in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis sub immediata huius Apostolicae Sedis iurisdictione ac potestate manebunt, plenamque iurisdictionem ordinariam in omnes fideles Graeco-Rutheni ritus, permanentes vel ad tempus in Foederatis Civitatibus Americae Septentrionalis commorantes exercebunt, sub dependentia tamen R. P. D. Delegati Apostolici Washingtonensis pro tempore.

Art. 3. Eidem ius ac potestas competit regendi ac gubernandi gregem suum ac leges et statuta condendi in iis quae iuri communi non adversantur. Praecipuus vero ipsius munus erit invigilare, ut tum doctrina et boni mores, tum ritus et disciplina Ecclesiae Graeco-Ruthenae catholicae integre custodiantur. Episcopi Graeco-Rutheni igitur erit uniformitatem caeremoniarum in variis devotionibus nec non in tradendis Sacramentis usitatarum, secundum rubricas Typici in ritu Graeco-Rutheno approbati, introducere, et eiusdem unitatis strictam observantiam a sacerdotibus suis expostulare.

Art. 4. Episcopus Missiones Graeco-Ruthenas frequenter et regulariter visitare stricte tenetur, ut gregem sibi concreditum apprime

cognoscat, eaque omnia, quae ad spirituale eius bonum attinent, melius provideat.

Art. 5. In canonica visitatione parochiarum inquirat Episcopus an parochi omnia parochialia munera, praesertim visitationem infirmorum, puerorum instructionem, verbi Dei praedicationem in Dominicis et festis, diligenter absolvant; videat insuper omnes libros baptismatum, matrimoniorum ac mortuorum; inventariumque bonorum ecclesiasticorum ex ultimo biennio; ac rationes ab unoquoque rectore missionis expostulet, id est introspeciat ac probet libros proventuum et expensarum cuiuslibet Ecclesiae, statum materiale eiusdem, debita, etc. Ut autem securitati bonorum temporalium ecclesiarum, coemeteriorum et omnium eorum, quae ad Ecclesiam pertinent, summa cum diligentia prospiciatur, Episcopi Graeco-Rutheni erit, audito in pertractandis negotiis virorum peritorum ac consultorum suorum consilio, eas tituli possessionis formas adhibere, omnesque praescriptiones servare, quae legibus singulorum Statuum respondeant, quaeque ecclesiasticorum bonorum administrationi, conservationi ac tutae in posterum transmissioni faveant.

Art. 6. Annua sustentatio Episcopi consistet in praestationibus ad instar cathedratici, quae iuxta aequitatem ab Episcopo, audita voce suorum consultorum, determinabuntur, quasque singulae ecclesiae Ruthenae dioeceseos solvere tenentur. Rectores ecclesiarum respondere tenentur de exacta solutione harum praestationum et aliarum ab Episcopo eiusque consultoribus determinandarum, pro Seminario, orphanotrophio, missionibus, etc.

Art. 7. Ordinaria residentia Episcopi Graeco-Rutheni erit in urbe Neo-Eboracensi, N.Y., Vicarii vero Generalis ac rectoris Seminarii in urbe Philadelphensi, Pa.

Art. 8. Episcopus quinto quoque anno plenam et accuratam relationem de statu personali, morali ac materiali missionum proprii ritus exhibeat Delegato Apostolico, qui eam transmittet ad S. Congregationem de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis Ritus Orientalis; atque iuxta morem apud episcopos Statuum Foederatorum inductum, singulis saltem decenniis ad sacra Apostolorum limina accedat, ut obsequium et obedientiam suam Pontifici Summo praestet, eique rationem reddat de pastoralis muneris implemento, deque omnibus quae ad ecclesiae suae statum et cleri populique mores ac disciplinam, animarumque sibi concreditarum salutem pertinent.

Art. 9. Controversiae si quae exoriantur inter Episcopum Graeco-Rutheni ritus et episcopos latini ritus Statuum Foederatorum, deferantur in devolutivo tantum ad Delegatum Apostolicum Washingtonensem, salva, item in devolutivo, appellatione ad Apostolicam Sedem.

CAPUT II.

De Clero Graeco-Rutheno.

Art. 10. Sacerdotes Graeco-Rutheni, pro regionibus Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis designati, educentur in Seminario proprio Rutheno-Americano, vel etiam in aliis Collegiis, tum in America, tum extra-Americam, secundum necessitatem Ecclesiae Ruthenae ac iudicium Episcopi Rutheni. Ut Ecclesia Graeco-Ruthena in Statibus Foederatis laudabiliter crescere, dilatari ac providentialem missionem suam in Graeco-Ruthenos adimplere possit, necessarium est ei habere sacerdotes integros vita, zelo ac pietate praeditos, sufficienter eruditos, lucri non cupidos et a politicis factionibus alienos. Episcopi Rutheni grave munus erit tales missionarios quantocius educare et ultra in America sustentare, ac pro missionibus inter populum mittere. Ad sustentationem Seminarii et educationem missionariorum, tum rectores ecclesiarum, tum ipsae ecclesiae Graeco-Ruthenae in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis contribuent.

Art. 11. Antequam habeatur numerus sufficiens presbyterorum Graeco-Ruthenorum qui in Statibus Foederatis educati fuerint, si providenda occurrat de suo rectore aliqua missio Ruthenorum vel vacans vel noviter erecta, Episcopus Graeco-Rutheni ritus idoneum sacerdotem postulet ab episcopis Ruthenis vel Galitiae vel Hungariae per tramitem S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis Ritus Orientalis. Illi vero sacerdoti, qui proprio marte, neque ab Episcopo Graeco-Rutheno vocatus, neque a S. Congregatione missus, illuc perrexerit, Episcopus Graeco-Ruthenus nullas concedere potest facultates, sive celebrandi Sacrum, sive administrandi Sacramenta, sive munia ecclesiastica quomodocumque obeundi.

Art. 12. Sacerdotes pecuniam quaerentes, vel in fide ac moribus vacillantes, vel ebrietati faventes, nullo modo mittantur nec admittantur in Americam; et si tales inveniuntur, quantocius dimittantur.

Art. 13. Quilibet sacerdos, ex Europa proveniens et in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis commorans pro fidelium Graeco-Ruthenorum spirituali cura, semper manebit incardinatus dioecesi originis; attamen Episcopus originis iurisdictionem in eum nullo modo exercebit, sed praedictus sacerdos unice pendeat ab iurisdictione Episcopi Graeco-Rutheni. In patriam redire aut revocari supradicti sacerdotes nequeant sine expressa licentia Ordinarii Graeco-Rutheni ritus Statuum Foederatorum in scriptis concedenda. Episcopi originis respondere debent coram S. Congregatione de Propaganda Fide, si tales sacerdotes sine scriptis ab Ordinario Graeco-Rutheno Statuum Foederatorum datis admittant.

Art. 14. Omnes rectores missionum Graeco-Ruthenarum in

Statibus Foederatis amovibiles sunt ad nutum Ordinarii Graeco-Rutheni. Amoveri autem non poterunt absque causis gravibus et iustis.

Art. 15. Datur tamen facultas presbytero amoto appellationem interponendi, in devolutivo, contra decretum remotionis, ad tribunal Delegati Apostolici, qui infra tres menses a die appellationis causam definire curabit, salvo semper iure recursus ad Sanctam Sedem, item in devolutivo.

Art. 16. Sustentationi sacerdotis providebit Episcopus, salarium eidem assignando, assumendum iuxta proportionem ex omnium Ecclesiae proventuum massa seu cumulo.

Art. 17. Iura stolae et emolumenta sacri ministerii in singulis missionibus determinanda sunt ab Ordinario Graeco-Rutheno iuxta probatas diversorum locorum consuetudines.

Art. 18. Episcopus Graeco-Ruthenus nonnisi in clerum et populum Graeco-Ruthenum iurisdictionem suam exerceat; si tamen aliquo in loco exsistant fideles Graeco-Rutheni ritus, in eoque nondum sit missio Ruthena constituta, aut nullus adsit presbyter eiusdem ritus, poterit tunc iurisdictionem suam in fideles Graeco-Ruthenos presbytero latino loci communicare, certiorato Ordinario.

CAPUT III

De Fidelibus Graeco-Ruthenis.

Art. 19. Fideles Graeco-Rutheni tenentur frequentare ac libenter sustentare suas proprias ecclesias, ac observare praescripta sui ritus; tamen in regionibus, ubi desunt ecclesiae ac sacerdotes proprii ritus, et ubi propter longinquitatem ecclesiae suae non eam possunt nisi cum gravi incommodo adire, opus est ipsis Missam audire in ecclesia catholica alterius ritus, nec non Sacramenta accipere a presbytero alterius ritus.

Art. 20. Frequentatio ex parte Graeco-Ruthenorum, etiam continua, ecclesiarum ritus latini non inducit mutationem ritus. Transitus enim a ritu Graeco-Rutheno ad latinum Ruthenis, sive ad tempus sive stabiliter, in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis morantibus, concedi nequit nisi a S. Congregatione de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis Ritus Orientalis, gravibus et iustis intervenientibus causis, ab ipsa S. Congregatione cognoscendis, audito Episcopo Graeco-Rutheno.

Art. 21. Non licet sacerdotibus ritus Latini, sub poenis ab Apostolica Sede decretis et decernendis, quempiam Graeco-Ruthenum ad Latinum ritum amplectendum inducere.

Art. 22. Fideles Latini, etiamsi adsit presbyter Latini ritus, apud sacerdotem Graeco-Ruthenum ab Ordinario suo adprobatum, peccata sua confiteri et beneficium sacramentalis absolutionis valide

et licite obtinere possunt. Item, fideles Graeco-Rutheni peccata sua confiteri possunt apud sacerdotem Latinum ab Episcopo suo adprobatum. Presbyteri vero Latini absolvere non poterunt fideles Graeco-Rutheni ritus a censuris et casibus reservatis ab Ordinario Graeco-Rutheno statutis, absque venia eiusdem. Vicissim idem dicatur de presbyteris Graeco-Ruthenis quoad censuras et reservationes statutas ab Ordinariis Latini ritus.

Art. 23. Omnibus fidelibus cuiuscumque ritus datur facultas ut, pietatis causa, sacramentum Eucharisticum quolibet ritu confectum suscipiant; ac insuper, ubi necessitas urgeat, nec sacerdos diversi ritus adsit, licebit sacerdoti Graeco-Rutheno ministrare Eucharistiam consecratam in azymo; et vicissim sacerdoti Latino ministrare in fermentato; at suum quisque ritum in ministrando servabit.

Art. 24. Quisque fidelium praecepto Communionis paschalis ita satisfaciet, si eam suo ritu et quidem a parocho suo accipiat.

Art. 25. Sanctum Viaticum moribundis ritu proprio e manibus proprii parochi accipiendum est; sed, urgente necessitate, fas esto a sacerdote quolibet illud accipere; qui tamen ritu suo ministrabit.

Art. 26. Funerum celebratio ac emolumentorum perceptio in familiis mixti ritus, ad parochum illius ritus pertineant, ad quem defunctus pertinebat.

Art. 27. Ad vitanda gravia incommoda quae inde Graeco-Ruthenis evenire possint, licitum erit eis, de venia proprii Ordinarii, sua festa et sua ieiunia observare iuxta consuetudinem locorum in quibus degunt. Attamen haec observatio non inducit omnino mutationem ritus, neque tollit obligationem adimplendi praeceptum ecclesiasticum quoad audiendam Missam hoc tempore in sui ritus ecclesiis, si tales in loco exsistant.

CAPUT IV

De Matrimoniis inter fideles mixti ritus

Art. 28. Matrimonia inter catholicos Graeco-Ruthenos et Latinos non prohibentur; sed ad vitanda incommoda, quae ex rituum diversitate in familiis evenire solent, uxor, durante matrimonio, ritum viri sequi potest, quin ex hoc sui nativi ritus mutatio inducatur.

Art. 29. Soluta matrimonio, mulier proprium ritum originis resumere valet.

Art. 30. Matrimonia tum inter fideles Graeco-Ruthenos, tum inter fideles mixti ritus, servata forma decreti *Ne temere*, contrahi debent, ac proinde in ritu mulieris a parocho mulieris benedicenda sunt.

Art. 31. Dispensationes matrimoniales in matrimoniis mixti ritus, si quae sint dandae vel petendae, dentur et petantur ab episcopo sponsae.

Art. 32. Nati in regione Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis ex parentibus diversi ritus, ritu patris sunt baptizandi: proles enim utriusque sexus sequi omnino debet patris ritum.

Art. 33. Baptismus in alieno ritu ob gravem necessitatem susceptus, cum nimirum infans morti proximus esset vel natus esset in loco in quo, tempore nativitatis, parochus proprius patris non aderat, ritus mutationem non inducit; et sacerdos, qui baptizavit, proprio parocho testimonium baptismatis remittere debet.

Art. 34. Infantes ad eius parochi iurisdictionem pertinent, cuius ritus est eorum pater, exceptis natis ex illegitimo thoro qui sequuntur ritum matris.

Haec omnia Ssm̃us Dñus noster Pius div. prov. Papa X referente infrascripto huius S. Congregationis Rm̃o P. D. Secretario in audientia diei 12 augusti vert. anni rata habuit ac confirmavit praesensque decretum *ad decennium* valiturum edi iussit.

Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex aedibus huius S. Congregationis, die 17 augusti anno 1914.

FR. HIERONYMUS M. CARD. GOTTI, *Praefectus*.
HIERONYMUS ROLLERI, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

POPULAR SERMONS ON THE CATECHISM. From the German of Rev. Hubert Bamberg. Edited by Rev. Hubert Thurston, S.J. Vol. I. Faith. London: R. & T. Washbourne, Ltd.

IN preparing a catechetical discourse it is all important for the preacher to be able to put his finger on a sermon already preached and which he can preach—I should almost say—word for word. In the series of popular sermons by Father Bamberg those two *desiderata* have been secured. They have been taken down by a shorthand writer as they were preached, and as regards matter, treatment, and style they are all that could be desired in a catechetical discourse. They have all the enthusiasm and spirit of the spoken word.

The author's purpose is to give an exposition of the words of the Catechism, 'We should know, love, and serve God.' We know God by Faith, we love Him by keeping His Commandments, and we serve Him by the grace of the Sacraments. Hence the three volumes that comprise the series, on Faith, on the Commandments, and on the Sacraments, the first of which has just been published. It contains sixty sermons, covering practically the whole Catholic teaching on the subject of Faith. Especially beautiful are the sermons on the Messiah and on the Incarnation, and especially instructive are the discourses on Scripture, Tradition, and the Church.

The author does not give us the mere dry bones of dogma, nor does he smear them over with a lavish supply of rhetorical sauce. By masterly skill, amounting almost to a touch of genius, he avoids both defects. The interest in the subject is always sustained by means of homely examples explaining things that, no matter how clearly we may explain, yet are always difficult of comprehension to some of the congregation. His introduction of incidents of Scripture History and of Scriptural quotations is quite original, and very effective. He does not depend on the ordinary stock quotations, but throws a new light on portions of Scripture that were hitherto not made use of in the same apposite and happy manner. But the most conspicuous quality of these discourses is

their sincere piety. They are the expressions of a simple, straightforward, and pious soul; they are dogma throbbled out by the heart. This is a feature that is not easy to secure in catechetical instructions, and yet it is so necessary in order to appeal to the heart as well as to the mind of our congregation. Dogma should be flavoured by piety.

Although these sermons are a full and exhaustive exposition of Catholic teaching, yet they are short, not requiring more than fifteen minutes each to deliver. The author's simplicity of style secures this. Whenever he is argumentative and boldly puts forward objections, with all the skill of a trained theologian, his answers are always clear and concise, logical and convincing. He leads his listeners through the maze of argument with a steady, firm hand, beguiling the way with interesting anecdote. Incidentally he introduces, in a most ingenious manner, a wealth of extraneous information, yet bearing on the subject-matter of the discourse, that is always illuminating and useful. It is, indeed, true to say, as his translator has said, that there is a touch of genius running right through all his discourses.

These volumes will appeal not only to the preacher, but to the Catholic laity. They might very profitably be given as prizes to our Catholic youth in colleges and convents. They are so simple in style that they captivate the reader, and so full of information that they are admirable as books of reference for our Catholic laity when they wish to obtain a fuller knowledge of any Catholic dogma or to give an intelligent account of the faith that is in them.

M. R.

WHAT OF TO-DAY? By Father Bernard Vaughan, S.J.

THE present international crisis has been the occasion of a wonderful output of books and pamphlets on the philosophy, the politics, and the social and religious problems of European nations. The English and French authors chiefly direct themselves to the showing-up of the philosophy of Germany—'the philosophy of the madman'—its effect on the growth of Prussian militarism throughout all Germany; its application to industrialism and to Empire expansion, and, finally, its ultimate resultant in the horrors and atrocities inflicted on Belgium. The German episcopate likewise does not hesitate to denounce, in its war-pastoral, 'the modern, anti-Christian, irreligious mind-culture of Germany, with its external varnish and its internal rottenness, with its coarse pursuit of wealth and pleasure, with its no less arrogant than ridiculous supermen.'

There is no need of pastoral or pamphlet to expose the

corruption of French ideals and French living. France has acted with the ruthless logic of a syllogism. She has turned religion out of doors, slammed the door in her face, and boasted of her blackguardism. England is less logical than France. She tried the thin end of the wedge in her non-religious, Biblical education for her primary schools. Englishmen have always loved to point out the wrongdoings of other nations, and the nations have duly credited them with that undesirable characteristic. There has risen one in their midst, however, who does not hesitate to expose the crimes, the failings, and the weaknesses of his fellow-countrymen. In a remarkable book, entitled *What of To-Day?* Father Bernard Vaughan has remorselessly probed the cancerous growth of irreligion and immorality that is spreading its roots throughout the members of the English social body. No man is better qualified to undertake this task, to point out what is wrong with England, than Father Vaughan, for no man knows English ideals and English lives, from Park Lane to Whitechapel, better than he.

The book is a collection of papers, thirty-eight in number, on religious and social questions—Marriage, Spiritualism, Socialism, and Christianity, etc.—and on topics suggested by the present war. Although directly referring to England they can very truly, and with profit, be applied to other countries. They are written in Father Vaughan's usual easy, fluent, and picturesque style, revealing all the eloquence and earnestness of the preacher, and all the common sense of a man acquainted with the conditions of life of his fellow-countrymen, who have elicited his patriotic sympathy. He is always up-to-date in his examples, analogies, and similies, graphic, true to life. He has a wonderful facility in phrase-making, gives us some clever bon-mots as well as some masterpieces of prose, and sometimes reaches a very high level of eloquence. A few of the aphorisms with which the book abounds may not be out of place here. 'If men and women would but steel themselves to accept defeat, even in a game, with a light heart and a pleasant smile, they would find it far easier to grapple with real troubles and real losses'; 'The Lord's Prayer is a treasury of grace, an arsenal of spiritual weapons, and a school of lessons in the ascetic life'; 'Philosophy hopes to cure the vices of human nature by appealing to the head, Christianity by educating the heart'; 'Men are like regular verbs (in French), knowing one I know them all, in all their moods and tenses. . . . Women are like irregular verbs, and unless a man studies them individually, in their every peculiar mood and tense, he will be likely to misunderstand them, much to his own discomfiture.'

There is a great deal of common sense, straight, plain talk to laymen, that cannot fail to put grit and backbone into them in their attitude towards religion, its principles and practices, and a great deal of eloquent pleading to his countrymen to return to a cleaner and higher moral life when they have passed through the cleansing fire of war.

The proceeds of the sale of the book are devoted to the Belgian Refugees' Fund.

M. R.

THE PARABLES OF THE GOSPEL: AN EXEGETICAL AND PRACTICAL EXPLANATION. By Leopold Fonck, S.J. Translated by E. Leahy, with a Preface by Rev. George O'Neill, S.J., M.A. New York: Pustet; London: Herder.

THE use of parables is characteristic of Our Lord's method of teaching. He frequently clothes the truths of heaven with the garb of earthly things in order to make them visible to us. The analogies of grace and of nature are best indicated by Him Who is the Author of both. From the fields in springtime and in harvest, from the trees in winter and summer, from the lakes and rivers, from the simplest occurrences of daily life, does the Creator and Saviour of the world draw images and lessons most profitable to souls. Nowhere in human literature could one find any representations of truth comparable to those of the Divine Artist enshrined in our Gospels.

The Church understands the importance of this teaching by parables. She knows not only that the greater part of her Divine Founder's doctrine was delivered to the multitudes in symbolical or figurative language, but that such language is the best suited to convey it. And she continues His mission and His work. It has often been noticed that the majority of the Sunday Gospels are parables.

And all commentators, ancient and modern, from the Fathers of the first centuries down to the professors of our own, have devoted a great deal of attention to the explanation of these allegorical illustrations of supernatural truth. Of many, the meaning may be regarded as known with certainty. In others, some parts have not been elucidated to the satisfaction of all readers. With regard to none can it be said that the mind of man has exhausted its meaning. The vastness of the literature on the subject is a proof of the ceaseless care that is bestowed on its every detail. Readers of the present volume will see that almost every work on the parables, collectively or singly, and on the questions connected with them, has been utilised or consulted by Father Fonck. His

volume takes the place of a small library. He has brought together *nova et vetera*, and has made the subject so completely his own that at the present day he is the specialist of the parables. A comparison between his work and some of our best commentaries will show the superiority derived from the being able to concentrate one's abilities. And Father Fonck has an advantage over many other writers. He spent years in the Holy Land, studying its natural features, its climate, botany, agricultural methods, domestic customs, etc. Hence he is familiar with the scenes which are described, the background in which the parables are set, and, as a natural consequence, his explanation possesses the local colouring which enables his readers to realise the meaning of Our Lord's words. We hope, therefore, that his work will have the wide circulation it well deserves.

CATHOLIC MORAL TEACHING AND ITS ANTAGONISTS. By Rev. J. Mausbach, D.D., Professor in the University of Münster. New York : J. F. Wagner ; London : Herder.

THE scope of the present work is to defend our ethical system against the attacks so persistently made on it by Harnack, Hermann, Hoensbroech, and others. The author remarks that in Germany, England, and America the gist of these attacks is much the same, so that an exposition of the truth will be equally useful in these countries. In this we believe him to be perfectly right. His own essay on ethics is a standard work ; he is conversant with all the subjects of the day ; and in the present volume he offers an exhaustive statement and vindication of the principles of Catholic morality. The introductory portion explains the relative positions of Catholics and non-Catholics with regard to moral questions, and incidentally it refutes the calumnies against Catholic teaching which find so ready acceptance on the part of ignorant Protestants. The body of the work, which contains the refutation *ex professo*, is divided into two parts. In the first, which is entitled 'The Position of Casuistry in Catholic Morals,' we find among several the following subjects admirably treated : 'Casuistry and Life,' 'Intention,' 'Mental Reservation.' The second and larger part is devoted to the consideration of 'Sin and Justification,' 'Law and Freedom,' 'Probabilism,' 'Morality and Happiness,' 'Church and State,' etc. A theologian will read the work with great interest, and to anyone who has to lecture, especially to mixed audiences, it will be invaluable. In conclusion we may say that the translation is excellent.

THE SUNDAY GOSPELS EXPLAINED TO CHILDREN. By Rev. M. Parks.
New York : J. F. Wagner ; London : Herder.

THE author of these discourses modestly calls them sermons for children, but they are not unsuited to adults. They are a simple exposition of the Gospels, and, therefore, as profitable when listened to at eighty years of age as when they were heard at eight. It is true that the ' questions for repetition ' show that the book is to be used at Sunday School in connexion with the sermon which has been delivered in church. As a help to this part of catechetical instruction, we hope it will be welcome to many teachers.

THE FRUIT OF THE TREE. By Mabel A. Farnum. London : Herder.

THIS is a short Catholic novel, and may be described as a sermon on Socialism, although there is nothing sermon-like in its style. The *Fruit* referred to in the title is the evil to body and soul that results from the socialist propaganda ; the *Tree* is Socialism itself ; and in the story the seed of this Tree of Evil is sown by the heroine, if heroine she may be called. Her unhappy but sincere efforts for what she regards as the people's good, her disillusionment and ultimate conversion, form the framework of an interesting tale through which is interwoven a thread of unconventional romance. The characters in the story are French-Americans, mostly of the working-classes, and the atmosphere of the book corresponds to the setting. Many of the descriptions of persons and of households remind us of Emile Souvestre. The book is very suitable for libraries.

R. J. R.

OUTSIDE THE WALLS. By Rev. B. F. Musser. London : Herder.

THE author, who is a convert, has gathered together a large number of quotations from non-Catholic writers and speakers, with a view to showing the friendly spirit prevailing to-day amongst many of those who are ' outside the walls ' of obedience to spiritual Rome. A variety of subjects are touched upon, such as the Papacy, Celibacy, Religious Orders, Divorce, and Devotion to Our Blessed Lady. Father Musser does not claim that bigotry is extinct in America ; but he shows that it has lost much of its bitterness, and, moreover, that all attempts to denounce the Catholic Church are strenuously opposed by a large body of representative non-Catholic Americans.

R. J. R.

CONFERENCES FOR BOYS. By Rev. Reynold Kuehnal. London : Herder.

PRIESTS who address boys' sodalities, and teachers who give religious instructions in schools, will find a good deal of useful matter in this book. It contains conferences easily adapted to suit boys of all kinds, from the boarding college *alumnus* to the news-seller. There are altogether about fifty Conferences, of which forty are devoted to the subjects usually dealt with in works of this kind, and the remainder are studies of some of the best-known models of youthful holiness, such as St. Stanislaus, St. Hermenegild, etc.

R. J. R.

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE CATECHISM. By Dr. M. Gatterer, S.J., and Dr. F. Krus, S.J. Translated by Rev. J. B. Culemans. London : Herder.

IN his prefatory remarks the translator notes that in our times 'under the guise of returning to the method of Christ,' there is a tendency to do away with the Catechism, as unsuited to the requirements of present-day pedagogy. We are not aware of any such tendency in Ireland, but, nevertheless, the work is welcome as a scientific contribution to priest's or teacher's library. The authors endeavour to hold an even balance between modern theories of education and the traditional teaching methods sanctified by twenty centuries of practical results. Their work is not a manual of Catechism, but a profound and psychological study of Catechisation and Catechetics, and will be useful to those who have not already made a special study of educational methods.

R. J. R.

SPIRITUAL INSTRUCTION FOR RELIGIOUS. By Rev. C. Coppens, S.J. London : Herder.

THE name of Father Coppens is already well and favourably known in the domain of spiritual literature, and this, his latest volume, is worthy to rank with its predecessors. It contains twenty conferences on subjects suitable for inclusion in spiritual retreats. They breathe throughout the spirit of the Love of God, and are written in a style remarkable for solidity and unction as well as for literary finish. We note with pleasure that the instructions have been so prepared as to be suitable for reading aloud in community. Many religious communities are so circumstanced as not to be able to hear frequently discourses suitable to the needs of their vocation. To supply such a want has been Father Coppens' aim in this volume. With the use of a little judgment on the part of the reader the *Instructions* should produce on the hearers an impression similar to that caused by the living voice of a preacher of the Word of God.

R. J. R.

SHORT SERMONS FOR THE CHILDREN'S MASS. By Rev. Frederick Reuter. London: Herder.

THIS volume contains for every Sunday of the year a simple lecture of about seven or eight hundred words. The teaching of the Gospel is conveyed in simple language, suited to the capacity of the young, and is illustrated by many examples. This volume, coming as it does from one who has been for many years engaged in preaching to children, will be welcomed by many young priests, and old priests, too, who experience difficulty in bringing home the sacred truths of Revelation to the child-mind.

R. J. R.

SHORT SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS. By Rev. F. Peppert. London: Herder.

IN this collection of sermons the Reverend author selects as a text a sentence or phrase from the Gospel of the Sunday, and from it develops his theme. The method affords greater liberty of treatment in the sermon itself. Instead of the usual familiar sermons, Father Peppert, in many cases, gives us a few simple pious thoughts, which are often more effective than a set sermon. Priests who use sermon books and are anxious to vary their discourses will find the volume helpful.

R. J. R.

BOOKS, Etc., RECEIVED

- America*; A Catholic Review (February).
The Ecclesiastical Review (February). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (February). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (February). New York.
The Austral Light (January). Melbourne.
The Ave Maria (January). Notre Dame, Indiana.
The Irish Monthly (February). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Catholic Bulletin (February). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (February). London: Longmans.
Our Boys (February). Edited by Christian Brothers, Dublin.
The Catholic Suffragist, Vol. I, No. 1. London: Berners Street.
Annals of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart (February). Cork: Guy & Co.
The Straight Path. By Rev. M. J. Phelan, S.J. London: Longmans.
St. Clare of Assisi. By Ernest Gilliat-Smith. London: Dent.
beata b'neanoáin le Seán ua Ceallaigh. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Missionary (February). Washington, U.S.A.
From Fetters to Freedom. By Rev. Robert Kane, S.J. London: Longmans.
The Story of St. Martin of Tours. By L. M. Stackpoole-Kenny. Dublin: Duffy.

The 'Summa Theologica' of St. Thomas Aquinas. Part II (First Part). Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London: Washbourne.

Catholic Truth Society (Ireland) Publications: *Belgium*, by R. L. P.; *Popular and Patriotic Poetry*, compiled by R. J. Kelly, K.C.; *Benedict XV*, by R. J. Kelly, K.C.

DR. HUSSEY, BISHOP OF WATERFORD, AND THE CONCORDAT OF 1801

BY VERY REV. P. BOYLE, C.M.

MANY biographical sketches of Dr. Hussey, Bishop of Waterford, have been published, and in most of them it is stated that his Lordship had a share in the negotiations which led up to the Concordat of 1801 between France and the Holy See.¹ By some of the writers the statement is made without hesitation, by others it is accompanied with some expression of doubt. It may, therefore, be of interest to inquire whether there is any solid foundation for such a statement. For this purpose it will be useful, in the first place, to give an outline of the stages of the negotiations of the Concordat; and, secondly, to inquire whether Dr. Hussey could have had a share in them.

The negotiations which led up to the Concordat of 1801 began in 1800. Soon after the battle of Marengo Bonaparte, then First Consul, on his way to France passed through Vercelli, where he was visited by Cardinal Martiniana, Bishop of that city. In the course of the interview Bonaparte referred to the state of religion in France, and expressed a desire to enter into negotiations with the Holy See with a view to a settlement of the religious affairs of that country.

Should the Holy See be disposed to commence negotiations, the First Consul expressed a wish that Mgr. Spina, titular Archbishop of Corinth, whose acquaintance he had made on a former occasion, should be sent to meet him

¹ See *Dictionary of National Biography*, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, *The Centenary History of Maynooth College*, *Life and Writings of Rev. Arthur O'Leary* by Rev. M. B. Buckley, 1868.

at Turin, for the purpose of an interchange of views. Cardinal Martiniana lost no time in communicating to the Pope the wishes of the First Consul. The Holy Father, having taken the advice of the Sacred College, decided to send Mgr. Spina to Turin, without official title or letters, with authority only to hear and report. Mgr. Spina set out for Turin. On arriving in that city he was informed that Bonaparte had already gone on, and had left instructions that the Archbishop of Corinth should meet him in Paris. Mgr. Spina, after due deliberation and advice, went on to Paris, accompanied by Father Caselli, General of the Servites. On reaching the French capital he took up his residence at the Hôtel de Rome, and notified his arrival to the First Consul. Bonaparte, on his part, manifested his readiness to enter on negotiations, and he appointed the Abbé Bernier, curé of Saint-Laud in Angers, whom he esteemed on account of the services he had rendered in the pacification of La Vendée, to treat with the envoy of the Holy See.

Many interchanges of views and conferences took place between Spina and Bernier. Drafts of a Concordat were drawn up and discussed, and submitted to the Holy See. While these interchanges of views were taking place in Paris, Bonaparte had sent as agent to Rome, M. Cacault, to make observations.

The negotiations went on slowly. None of the proposed drafts of a Concordat were judged acceptable by the Holy See. At length, when all hope of mutual agreement seemed at an end, M. Cacault, of his own accord, suggested that if a Cardinal were sent to Paris to continue the negotiations the First Consul would be complimented, and in consequence a successful issue might be hoped for. Pius VII accepted the suggestion; and after consulting the Sacred College made choice of Cardinal Consalvi, his Secretary of State, to go to Paris to treat with the First Consul. Consalvi set out from Rome on June 6, 1801, and passing through Siena, Florence, Turin, and Lyons reached Paris on June 20, where he took up his residence with Mgr. Spina.

and Father Caselli at the Hôtel de Rome. Without delay he notified his arrival to the First Consul. Having been presented at the Tuileries the negotiations were resumed. For five and twenty days interchanges of views and conferences went on between Consalvi, as representative of the Pope, and Bernier, the representative of Bonaparte. At length a draft of a Concordat which was judged acceptable was arrived at. It was agreed that it should be signed by three representatives of each of the contracting parties, namely, by Cardinal Consalvi, Mgr. Spina, and Father Caselli, on the part of the Holy See; and by Joseph Bonaparte, M. Cretet, Counsellor of State, and Abbé Bernier, on the part of the First Consul.

Bonaparte desired that the text of the Concordat should be signed on July 14, the National festival. He had invited Consalvi to a banquet at the Tuileries on that day, and had announced in the *Gazette de France* that the Cardinal had succeeded in the object of his mission. On the appointed day the commissaries met. Before attaching his signature Consalvi had taken the precaution of reading over the text of the document presented to him. To his great surprise he found that the text of the document presented for signature differed in important points from that which had been agreed upon. In consequence he refused to attach his signature to it. His refusal was reported to the First Consul. The banquet in commemoration of the National festival took place in the evening. Consalvi could not absent himself from it. While the guests were assembling for dinner Bonaparte went up to Consalvi, and addressed him in impassioned terms, saying: 'You may leave. There is nothing else to be done. You wished to break off. Be it so, as you wished it.' To these words Consalvi replied: 'I could not exceed my powers, nor consent to what is contrary to the principles professed by the Holy See.'¹

¹ In the French translation of Consalvi's Memoirs this incident is given thus: "Vous avez voulu rompre," dit Bonaparte. "Quand partez vous donc?"

All hope of a successful issue of the negotiations now seemed at an end. After dinner, however, Joseph Bonaparte requested the Cardinal to agree to hold a further sitting in order, if possible, to arrive at an agreement. The Cardinal assented, and, with the sanction of the First Consul, the discussions were resumed. After a long and anxious sitting of twenty-three hours an agreement was arrived at, and on July 15 the text of the Concordat was duly signed by the six commissaries above mentioned. Consalvi set out for Rome, where he arrived on August 6, after an absence of two months. On his arrival the text of the Concordat was examined by the College of Cardinals, and having been judged acceptable, it was ratified and promulgated by Pius VII in the Bull *Ecclesia Christi*, August 15, 1801. By that Bull a new constitution was given to the Church in France. In its application many details remained to be settled. It was judged advisable to appoint a Cardinal-Legate for that purpose, and at the request of Bonaparte, Cardinal Caprara was made choice of to regulate all matters of difficulty.

Such is the history, in outline, of the stages of the negotiations which resulted in the Concordat of 1801. Let us now pass on to inquire whether the Bishop of Waterford had any share in those negotiations. Dr. Hussey had been educated in Spain, and had long held the post of chaplain to the Spanish Embassy in London; and of agent of his Most Christian Majesty in the British Isles. In this way he became acquainted with many statesmen, and especially with the Spanish Ambassadors in London. Amongst these was the Marquis de Muzquiz, who, in 1800, held the office of Spanish Ambassador in

"Après diner, general," repliquai-je-d'un ton calme. Ce peu de mots fit faire un soubresaut au premier consul."

'En réalité,' says Boulay de la Meurthe, 'Consalvi n'a pas fait cette réponse cavalière. Voici le texte vrai de ses mémoires.'

'Voi potete partire non essendoci altro da fare. Avete voluto rompere, et sia pur così, giacche lo avete voluto. A queste parole dette in publico, et con tuono il piu forte, reposi, che io non poteva ni oltropassare i miei poteri, ni convenire in cose che fossero contrarie ai principi che professa la Santa Sede.'—Note in Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur le Concordat*, vol. iii. p. 232.

Paris. From the documents relative to the negotiations of the Concordat, published by Boulay de la Meurthe, we learn that the Marquis de Muzquiz took an active and friendly interest in those negotiations. Mgr. Spina and Father Caselli arrived in Paris on November 5, 1800. In a dispatch dated November 9, Muzquiz notified their arrival to his Government. He added that the Papal Envoy would treat privately with the representatives of the French Government of the ecclesiastical matters which formed the real object of his mission; that a preliminary conference had already taken place between the Envoy and the famous Bernier, curé of La Vendée, who had contributed so much to the pacification of that country, and who in consequence enjoyed the esteem and confidence of Bonaparte.¹ The Ambassador goes on to say: 'Bishop Hussey may be useful here for the Roman negotiation, and hence it will be fitting that he act as your Excellency has already directed.'²

In another letter to M. Urquiza, Spanish Minister, dated November 21, 1800, Muzquiz refers to Mgr. Spina: 'I see him (Mgr. Spina) frequently, and I try to secure him a good reception; and I shall not fail to support him as far as possible, by using the means which seem to me opportune for the successful issue of his negotiations according as it may please your Excellency to instruct me.'³

The Bishop of Waterford had arrived in Paris in the autumn of 1800, and soon came into relation not only with the Spanish Ambassador, but also with Mgr. Spina and with the Abbé Bernier. In January, 1801, we find him

¹ 'Entre tanto tratara secretamente los puntos ecclesiasticos, que hacen el verdadero objeto de su mision con los diputados de este gobierno; habiendo ya tenida una conferencia general y preliminar con el famoso Bernier, cura de la Vendée, qui ha contribuido tanto a apaciguar aquellos paises, et qui goza por tanto del aprecio et confianza de Bonaparte.'

² 'El obispo Hussey puede ser util aqui para la negociacion de Roma, y asi conviendra que se quede segun Usted lo ha mandado. (Alcala. leg. 5205.)—Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur la negotiation du Concordat*, vol. i. p. 116.

³ 'Le veo frecuentemente, procuro agasajarle, y ne dejaré de apoyarle en cuanto pueda, praticanda las diligencias, que me insinué ser convenientes, para la feliz conclusion de su negociacion, conforme se sirve, V.E. prevenirme. (Alcala. leg. 3963.)—Ibid., vol. i. p. 130.

taking part in a function in Paris, which is thus recorded in the *Annales Philosophiques*, 1801, tom. i. page 146 :—

On 18th January the Feast of St. Sulpice was celebrated at the Church des Carmes. The Bishop of Saint-Papoul officiated pontifically. The Bishop of Senlis was present, as well as the Bishop of Waterford in Ireland. M. Bernier, curé of Angers, delivered a discourse in which, combining sentiment with judgment, he praised the intentions of the Government as favourable to peace and to the re-establishment of religion desired by all Frenchmen. Mgr. the Archbishop of Corinth, who has not yet appeared publicly in his official capacity, confined himself to assisting at the High Mass and sermon in a tribune overlooking the sanctuary. But this did not hinder the preacher from addressing to him a compliment which was justly applauded.¹

From November, 1800, to May, 1801, frequent conferences and interchanges of views, to which the Spanish Ambassador was no stranger, took place between Spina and Bernier. In June Cardinal Consalvi arrived and took charge of the negotiations, Bernier continuing to act for the First Consul. In his Memoirs the Cardinal gives few details of the persons who aided him, but he makes express mention of the Spanish Ambassador² as one of those who supported him.

What share, then, can Dr. Hussey have had in the negotiation of the Concordat? Boulay de la Meurthe, who has collected with great care the official papers regarding the negotiations between the Holy See and France in 1800-1801, is inclined to think that the Bishop of Waterford

¹ 'On a célébré le dimanche 18 Janvier la fête de Saint-Sulpice dans l'Eglise des Carmes. M. l'Evêque de Saint-Papoul y a officié pontificalement; M. l'Evêque de Senlis y a assisté, ainsi que M. l'Evêque de Waterford en Irlande. M. Bernier curé d'Angers a fait le prône, dans lequel melant heureusement la sensibilité à la sagesse, il a célébré les vues favorables du gouvernement pour la paix, et le retablissement de la Religion Catholique, demandé par tous les français. Mgr. l'Archêveque de Corinthe n'ayant point encore déployé publiquement son caractère, s'est contenté d'assister à la grande Messe et d'entendre le sermon dans une tribune donnant dans le sanctuaire, ce qui n'a pas empêché l'orateur de lui adresser un complement justement applaudi.'—Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur la negotiation du Concordat, et sur les autres rapports de la France avec le Saint Siègè en 1800-1801*, vol. i. p. 293. (Paris, 1886-97; 5 vols., 8vo.)

² *Memoirs*, vol. i., p. 361. French Edition.

had no part in them. In a note to the dispatch of Muzquiz, November 9, 1800, he says : 'M. Hussey, Bishop of Waterford in Ireland, had the title of chaplain to his Catholic Majesty and had served the chapel of the Spanish Embassy in London. Having arrived at Berlin from England in the month of July he came from thence to visit his friend, M. de Muzquiz. He was to spend the winter in Paris. But though he saw Mgr. Spina several times he does not appear to have got into the secret of the religious negotiation.'¹

The opinion of Boulay de la Meurthe is of great weight. But it is far from decisive. On the one hand, there is the assertion of many Irish writers that Dr. Hussey had a share in the negotiations. Father M. B. Buckley may be taken as an instance. 'He (Dr. Hussey),' writes Father Buckley, 'was amongst those entrusted by the Holy See in 1802 with drawing up the details of the Concordat between the Pope and the First Napoleon, in which delicate mission he won the applause of his Holiness Pius the Seventh, and elicited the special and enthusiastic admiration of the discerning Bonaparte.'²

Such assertions, though exaggerated and inaccurate, may contain an element of fact. Moreover, the documents published by Boulay de la Meurthe show that the Spanish Ambassador took an active part in furthering the mission of Mgr. Spina, and that he intended to make use of the services of the Bishop of Waterford for the purpose of the negotiations. They show that Dr. Hussey who was in Paris during the whole period of the negotiations was in relation with Mgr. Spina and with the Abbé Bernier. Moreover, in a long and difficult negotiation the principal agents often take the advice of others, and

¹ 'M. Hussey, Evêque de Waterford en Irlande, avait le titre d'aumonier de S. M. Catholique, et avait desservi la chapelle de l'Ambassade d'Espagne à Londres. Arrivé d'Angleterre à Berlin au mois de Juillet il était venu auprès de M. de Muzquiz dont il était l'ami. Il devait passer l'hiver à Paris ; mais quoi qu'il ait vu plusieurs fois Mgr. Spina, il ne paraît pas avoir pénétré dans le secret de la négociation religieuse.'—*Documents sur la Concordat*, vol. i. p. 116, note.

² *Life and Writings of Rev. Arthur O'Leary*, by Rev. M. B. Buckley, p. 310.

are glad to have at hand a skilful and experienced diplomatist to aid by his counsel and serve as a medium of communication. There is no evidence to show that Dr. Hussey was one of the official negotiators. These were, at the commencement, Spina and Bernier, and at the conclusion Consalvi, Spina, and Caselli, on behalf of the Holy See, and Joseph Bonaparte, Cretet, and Bernier, on the part of the First Consul. But the statements and documents given above supply circumstantial evidence to make it probable that the Bishop of Waterford had a real share in the negotiations, at least as counsellor and adviser of the chief negotiators.

On September 5, 1801, Pius VII addressed a letter to the Bishop of Waterford at Paris, in which His Holiness praises his zeal and his labours for the interests of the Catholic Church in England and in Ireland, and especially for the success with which, through the patronage of the Most Catholic King, he had obtained from the First Consul the reorganisation of the Irish ecclesiastical colleges in France. In that letter no mention is made of services rendered in connexion with the Concordat. The fact that a letter written at that date contains no reference to such services may seem to throw doubt upon the reality of them. But it is to be borne in mind that the letter of the Holy Father was a reply to a communication of the Bishop of Waterford offering congratulations on his election, and informing him of the success of the negotiations on behalf of the Irish colleges in France; and, therefore, the Holy Father in his reply touches only on the points mentioned in the letter of Dr. Hussey. On September 5, so soon after the ratification of the Concordat, the Holy Father, or his Secretary at Rome, could hardly have had time to be informed of all the details of the negotiations, nor of the services rendered by those who may have aided the principal negotiators by their influence and advice. It may be doubted, too, whether the usages of official correspondence would have admitted references to such services at such a time. Hence, notwithstanding the

silence of the letter of the Holy Father, we may still incline to the conclusion that Dr. Hussey had a real, though not a principal, part in the negotiation of the Concordat of 1801 between the Holy See and France.¹

PATRICK BOYLE, C.M.

¹ In the I. E. RECORD, January, 1904 (vol. xv. pp. 48 et seq.), an account is given of the services rendered by Dr. Hussey to the Irish Colleges in Paris, together with a translation of the letter of Pius VII, September 5, 1801, above referred to. During his stay in Paris Dr. Hussey seems to have resided with Dr. Walsh at the Collège des Lombards. In a pamphlet published by the latter in 1814 in vindication of his administration, he writes as follows:—

‘Il (Ferris) m’accuse enfin d’avoir fait des dépenses inconsidérées pour recevoir de temps à autres les évêques insulaires, et notamment d’avoir defrayé trop longtemps Monseigneur l’Evêque de Waterford, qui avait dans le temps concouru à sauver nos biens d’alienation. De pareils details sont vraiment honteux.’ M. Ferris est bien le maître d’envoyer Nos Seigneurs les Prélats à habiter dans les hotels garnis; mais cette manière d’agir n’était pas la mienne. Car je reconnaissais un évêque insulaire comme premier supérieur de la maison pendant le séjour qu’il y faisait.’—Walsh, *Memoire pour Walsh*, Paris, 1814, p. 24.

CONSANGUINITY

BY REV. DAVID BARRY

THE clergy are so often called on to assist at or sanction the marriage of those who are related by blood that an account in English of the justification and extension of the impediment of consanguinity, and of the legislating and dispensing authority in connexion with it, may be of some interest.

The fundamental reason, I think, assigned by the theologians why the Church has sanctioned or recognised consanguinity within certain limits as a diriment impediment is, that the marriages of those who are close blood relations are likely to be barren, or, on the most favourable supposition, to yield a progeny, some of whom will be weak, enfeebled, and defective. Everyone knows that, even when there is no disease, or tendency to it, acquired or inherited, in either of the parents, the children born to them sometimes have a special liability to infirmities, mental or physical, e.g., lunacy or consumption. And *a fortiori*, of course, if there be any delicacy in one of the parents it very frequently reappears in one or more of the children.

Now, it stands to reason that if both of the parents have the same weakness or deficiency, whether in physical or mental faculties, the liability to inherit this affliction is much greater than it would be if one of them were normal in this particular; and much greater still than in the hypothesis that one is diseased and the other particularly sound and healthy in the same faculty or organ. For the abundant health and strength that a child may be expected to derive from one side would possibly counteract or hold in check the weakness and delicacy of constitution accruing

from the other side. But in the case of blood relations there is evidently a far greater chance that they have the same complaints and disabilities than there would be supposing they had no common ancestor; and so if they marry each other they are more likely to have children born with their undesirable characteristics, than if they married strange partners, whose robustness may well compensate for their defects.

Accordingly, the Church consults the interests of the prospective offspring of her children by preventing them from marrying within the nearer degrees of consanguinity. It is evident, too, that these evils, especially if there be question of a couple very closely related, are so radically and directly opposed to the objects of the Sacrament as to call for the invalidating, rather than the mere prohibition, of alliances that will probably give rise to them.

I know, indeed, that it is a tendency of modern medical theories to assert that no disease, or scarcely any one, is passed on by heredity; but whether this is so or not, it is unquestionable that very marked and baleful propensities are sometimes thus transmitted—so marked and baleful, indeed, that the disease itself is almost certain to be contracted early in life. According to statistics given by Gasparri,¹ if the chances of having a deaf-mute in an ordinary family be represented by one, the chances will be eighteen in marriages between first cousins, and thirty-seven in those between nephews and aunts. The same authority says that it has been computed that in Berlin there are 3·1 deaf-mutes in every 10,000 Catholics, and 6 and 27, respectively, for every 10,000 Protestants and Jews; a proportion which may be taken as indicating with fair accuracy the facilities given for consanguineous unions by the three communions. Again, it is stated that in Iowa, in 1848, the proportion of deaf-mutes among the whites to those among the slaves was that of $\frac{2}{3}$ to 212; which was plainly due to the hapless condition of slavery

¹ *Tractatus Canonicus de Matrimonio*, i. n. 762, note.

which was such an incentive to unions of this undesirable character.

Another reason why this impediment was established is, that conjugal relations are incompatible with, and the mere prospect of them would impair, the delicacy—I had almost said reserve—which should naturally characterise the inter-relations of members of the same family. In other words, the requirements of the virtue of piety, and especially the reverence and wholesome respect towards parents on which it is based, and which is reflected from them on their near relations, cannot be harmonised with the equality which essentially exists between husband and wife.

Again, the marriages in question are forbidden for a reason that is very important in itself, and is closely connected with one of the secondary objects of the Sacrament, viz., the prevention of improper relations and even of the suspicion of their existence. The narrow and straitened circumstances of some families and the tainted moral atmosphere about them are, unfortunately, often such as to neutralise the natural respect of their members for one another, accruing from their close relationship; and so, if there were any hope of mitigating or palliating or concealing improper conduct by subsequent marriage, a very necessary corrective of, and barrier against, temptation would be done away with. And in this way, too, the impediment is useful as a sanction and protection of the marks of regard and affection which should attach to the intercourse of relatives with each other, inasmuch as it makes it impossible for even the most weak or malicious to misrepresent them as originating in an unwholesome affection.

Moreover, in former times communities were very self-centred, and very parochial in their outlook and sympathies. Now, nothing could so tend to foster interest in and generate kindly feelings among those who did not live contiguous to one another as intermarriage between them, which was a natural result of the impediment of

consanguinity. Those acquainted with early Roman history or legend will remember the pacific effects of taking outside partners, and will realise that Church legislation on this point was well calculated to do away with distrust and suspicion, and soften feelings of rancour and enmity. Of course the efficacy of the impediment in this respect is not intimately connected with the objects of the Sacrament of Matrimony; and so, if this were the sole or principal justification of it, it would not have been more than prohibitory in character. Moreover, in modern times people take their full share in the life and activity of the nation to which they belong; they are no longer isolated by barriers of ignorance and prejudice; and relations of some sort, though not always very friendly, exist almost between the entire world. Consequently, the value of the impediment as an eirenicon is now, and has been for a long time, very meagre.

Of course it cannot be denied that there are certain advantages likely to ensue from the marriage of those nearly related, that may not be looked for with such confidence in the case of outsiders; such, as similarity of temperament, intimate acquaintance with the habits and thoughts, likes and dislikes, of one another, special regard for each other, due to their common parentage, etc. But these are not of such a character as to offset the disadvantages I have tried to outline; still there may be other and more weighty reasons present sometimes, which, accordingly, may justify the giving of a dispensation in particular cases where this is not altogether precluded by the Divine law.

Coming now to treat of the extension of this impediment, the learned readers of the I. E. RECORD will pardon my mentioning what are the elements of the subject; but an allusion to them is a necessary foundation for the rather elaborate canonical structure to follow.

Consanguinity, then, is by Church law a bar to marriage between all persons in the direct line of descent, that is between children and their parents, grandchildren

and their grandparents, etc. And in the indirect or collateral line between those who are full third cousins and those more nearly related, such as uncles and their nieces, nephews and aunts, first cousins, etc. Those, however, in the collateral line who are in any respect more distantly related than third cousins, even though they be in another respect more closely related, are outside the purview of the impediment. Thus, if what we call third and fourth cousins are anxious to get married, or even first and fourth (a very unlikely supposition), there is nothing to prevent them.

For in the eye of the Canon law those who are removed unequal distances from the common ancestor, e.g., his son and his great-granddaughter, are only supposed to be related in the degree appertaining to the more remote of them, though there is an obligation, when one is seeking a dispensation, to mention the nearer degree as well. In canonical parlance, the persons I have just mentioned would be related in the third degree reaching first (*in tertio attingente primum*). In the direct line the degree of relationship is ascertained by computing the number of generations that one is removed from the other, or the series of persons in the line—less one: thus, grandfather and granddaughter are in the second degree; and in the collateral line it is the number of generations that each is removed from the common ancestor, for instance, second cousins are in third degree. Or to put the matter in another way, the degree in the indirect line corresponds to the number of persons in the genealogy of either of the couple—less one.

When seeking a dispensation in consanguinity it is immaterial whether the relations which gave rise to it were legitimate or otherwise. It is important to note, too, that it is of no consequence (in the collateral line) whether the original stock of the parties about to be married consisted of a couple or of only one person; e.g., in the case of first cousins, whether they had the same grandfather and the same grandmother or had only one

of these in common. But, as we shall see later on, if the relationship of both or of one of them with this stock is traced back through *both* members of an intermediate couple, it is of the greatest importance to mention this circumstance.¹

In the Roman civil law, while the method of estimating the degrees in the direct line was the same as the canonical one, the way of reckoning in the indirect line was quite the reverse. For the Roman jurists held that the number of degrees corresponded to the sum of the generations intervening between both the parties and the common ancestor, or to the number of persons in the genealogies of *both*—less two. So instead of considering a niece and uncle, e.g., as related in the second and first degree, as we do, they computed the relationship as in the third degree; similarly first cousins were considered to be in the fourth degree, etc. Our present system is undoubtedly of German origin²; but as to when and where the Church discarded the Roman one for it, canonists are not agreed, though there can be no question that the change was due to the incursions of the Teutonic hordes, and the desire of the Church to accommodate itself in non-essentials to their habits and customs.

Some say that Gregory the Great (590-604) adopted the new process of computation, in his instruction to St. Augustine about the marriages of the English, when he sanctioned marriages between persons in the *tertia* and *quarta generatio*, but altogether forbade them between those in the second, i.e., first cousins. This seems to be the view of Gasparri, who says that our present system dates *ab antiquissimis temporibus*; others, however, contest the authenticity of the instruction in question, notwithstanding the authority of the Venerable Bede, and ascribe the new departure to Gregory II (721-726). All, however, are agreed that it was fully accepted in the time of Alexander II (1061-1073), who said that it was a new

¹ See p. 353 *infra*.

² Wernz, *Jus Decretalium*, tom. iv. p. ii. n. 407.

and unheard of error to assert that brothers and sisters were in the second generation. And in the eleventh century, in many places at least, the impediment had been extended to the seventh (canonical) degree by custom and practice¹ which, as in the case of so many other impediments, had much to do, not with its introduction, but with defining and sanctioning its extension. It is not, however, certain that the impediment in the indirect line was ever diriment, in so far as it went beyond the fourth degree. However this may be, it was entirely restricted to this degree of the collateral line by Innocent III at the Fourth Council of Lateran (1215), and has remained so since.

In the Old Law, besides the degrees that were diriment by the Divine Law, the marriage of a nephew with his father's or mother's sister was forbidden, but this disability does not seem to have been enforced between a niece and her uncle.²

In the Eastern Churches in communion with Rome, consanguinity is recognised only as far as the seventh degree, according to the civil computation, that is third cousins 'touching' second, or as we commonly say, second and third; and in that degree it is only prohibitive, not diriment. Our Roman legislation, however, is adopted in some of these Churches. In the National Greek Church the impediment extends to the sixth (civil) degree, i.e., third cousins; and in the Russian Church to the fourth (civil) degree, i.e., second cousins.

In the early days of Rome the marriage of cousins was not allowed, though it was not unusual after the Second Punic War; but marriage between uncle and niece was always regarded as unlawful.

According to English law consanguinity is not an impediment for first cousins, as it merely bars unions between brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts, nephews and nieces, in the indirect line, and between parents and children,

¹ See Wernz, *op. cit.*, n. 409, note 40.

² See Levit. xviii. and xx.; Deuter. xxvii.

grandparents and grandchildren, in the direct line. However, within these limits the impediment is regarded by civil jurists as making the marriages absolutely null and void since 1835; previously they were only regarded as voidable. English law, too¹—as indeed do all modern codes, according to Wernz—adopts the old Roman method of counting the degrees, and it is indifferent whether the intercourse on which the relationship is based was legitimate or not. So far as I know it does not provide any machinery for granting a dispensation, as there is in France, where the impediment has the same extension, except that it does not arise from immoral relations.

It is time now to say a few words as to the duplication or multiplication² of consanguinity—a matter which is of considerable practical importance—and which I freely confess I have found somewhat complicated, at least beyond its initial steps. It happens in three cases in the indirect line. First, when the parties that are about to get married derive their descent from *two or more common stocks*. Secondly, when they have only one stock in common but one or both of them—it does not matter, so far as the number of impediments is concerned, which is the case—come from the common ancestor *in different ways*, that is, through both members of an intermediate couple. Thirdly, in case a combination of these two causes occurs, when the impediment is increased correspondingly. These principles are well-established, but their application in detail is not, or was not till recently, a matter of quite settled theology.

The first one is to be applied in two cases :

(a) Where two members of one family have married two members of another. Let us suppose that a brother and sister named O'Brien have married a brother and

¹ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, art. 'Consanguinity.' Other authorities, e.g., the *Standard Dictionary*, say it adopts the canonical method. But the question is only one of terminology, for the exact amplitude of the legal prohibition is certain.

² These are the terms usually employed, but it should be always remembered that the process is one of addition.

sister named Murphy; now, the young O'Briens are debarred from marrying the young Murphys by a double impediment in the second degree of the collateral line.¹ For they have come from both the O'Brien stock and the Murphy stock, and they are in the second generation from each of these. And, as I have remarked already, it is of no consequence whether the fathers and mothers of the young generation in such a case were full or only half-brothers and sisters.

(b) The second case, where the young pair have a two-fold stock in common, is where one of their ancestors had children by two partners that were related to each other. For instance, let us assume that John White was first married to Mary Smith, by whom he had children, and after her death to her sister Catherine, by whom he had children also. Now, if John White's grandson by Mary wishes to marry his granddaughter by Catherine, the couple have John White as a common ancestor, from whom they are separated two steps. But they also have (within the forbidden degrees) the father of his two wives in common—Thomas Smith—from whom they are distant in the third degree.² So the parties 'consanguinei sunt tum in secundo gradu ex stipite Joanne White, tum in tertio ex stipite Thoma Smith.' It seems a bit anomalous that if the persons in question had the same grandmother as well as the same grandfather, though they would in reality be more nearly related than I have supposed them to be, yet according to Canon law there would be only one impediment in the case, that, namely, in the second degree. But the reason of this is what I have mentioned already—that in tracing descent from a primary stock the relationship is held to be equally near whether this stock, in so far as it is common, consists of two persons or of one.

The second principle of multiplication—that due to descent in different ways from the same stock—applies

¹ Decided by the Holy Office, February 22, 1899.

² Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Moralis*, ii. n. 988, 11th Edition.

when a marriage of relations has intervened between the young people and their common ancestor. For example, Peter had three sons—James, John, and Francis. A son of John got married to a daughter of Francis, and they have a daughter Jane. Jane is doubly related to Nicholas, James's grandson. Because though Nicholas comes only in one way from the stock Peter, Jane descends in two ways from him, viz., through her father and through her mother. So Nicholas and Jane are related 'in duplici tertio aequali ex stipite Petro.'

Lehmkuhl¹ gives another example of the application of this principle, which, so far as I can understand it, is this : A widower and a widow got married and had a son, John. A son and a daughter of theirs, respectively, by their first marriages, also got married and had a daughter, Mary. Now, John and Mary wish to get married ; what is the relationship between them ? And, with all deference, I must say that I cannot see how either of them comes from the same original stock in more ways than one. John clearly does not ; and neither does Mary, for through her mother, indeed, she comes from the widow, and through her father from the widower, but the widower and the widow are in regard to her quite distinct stocks, who are united only in relation to their son, John.

I see the difficulty, of course, of maintaining that John and Mary have two stocks in common ; for though these are distinct enough in the case of the girl, they are merged in one in the case of the man. Speaking with the greatest reserve I should say that this case is not covered by either of the principles I have enunciated, but is as it were *sui generis*.

In giving an example of the conjoint operation of these two principles, which is the third source of the multiplication of impediments, I am on surer ground, for the case I am selecting has been decided by the Holy See. It was represented to the Holy Office by a French Bishop that in his country first cousins often wished to marry each

¹ loc. cit.

other, whose grandparents were also first cousins. So that the young couples had two stocks in common—both an original one, to which they were attached in the fourth degree, and an intermediate, to which they were two degrees nearer. The Bishop went on to explain, with a view to getting an authoritative decision on the question, that theologians did not agree as to how many impediments existed in such a case. Some maintained that there was only one, that, namely, in the second degree, for the alleged reason that canonical jurisprudence did not permit one to enumerate the same stock twice, as would necessarily be the case if the relationship were to be traced also to the fourth degree. Others, he explained, contested the application of this canonical maxim, and were of opinion that the union of the parties was barred for a threefold reason—an impediment in the second degree which all admitted, and two in the fourth degree: the two in the latter degree being due to the fact that the parties were descended from the original stock, both through their grandfathers and through their grandmothers. While still another class of canonists hesitated to take sides on the matter.

The Holy Office, on March 11, 1896, decided that there were three impediments in the case. But, notwithstanding, some, later on, apparently harboured the view that there were only two, one in the fourth and the other in the second degree; for the Sacred Congregation found it necessary to affirm its previous decision on February 22, 1899.

The case, accordingly, authoritatively illustrates the multiplication of the impediment, due both to descent from two common stocks and to descent, in different ways, from the same stock.

It may be well, now, to say a few words as to the meaning of two terms which frequently occur in the treatises in connexion with consanguinity and affinity—*gradus simplex* and *gradus mixtus*. Sometimes they are used to denote respectively that there is not, or that there

is, a duplication or multiplication of affinity or consanguinity, as I have just explained.

Sometimes, again, *gradus simplex* is used to denote that, besides consanguinity or affinity, no impediment of a different character exists in the case; in contradistinction to *gradus mixtus*, which denotes that such impediment co-exists. They are used in this sense when an indult is given to dispense ‘super aliquo gradu consanguinitatis sive simplici, sive mixto cum cognatione spirituali vel affinitate.’¹

Again, the terms are employed to signify whether the parties are, or are not, equally nearly connected with their common ancestor. It is in this sense that they are most appropriately and most generally used and are, respectively, equivalent to *gradus aequalis* and *gradus inaequalis*.

I come now to the discussion of the question as to what is the primary source of the prohibition and annulment of marriages between blood relations. Is the ecclesiastical law alone responsible? Or does this merely sanction and define what has been prescribed by the natural law or Divine positive law?

All theologians are agreed that marriages between parents and their children are prohibited and made void by the law of nature. According to St. Ambrose,² ‘Connubium patris cum filia pugnat cum lege naturae in singulorum cordibus scripta.’ And St. Thomas says³: ‘Inordinatum est quod filia patri per matrimonium adjungatur in sociam causa generandae prolis et educandae, quam oportet per omnia patri esse subjectam veluti ex eo procedentem.’ It is unnecessary to say that there has been a positive Divine precept to the same effect.⁴ And, indeed, the history of the human race bears testimony in the same sense.⁵ For among peoples that were fairly civilised the ancient Assyrians and Persians alone seem to have permitted such unions.

¹ Gasparri, op. cit., n. 761.

² Quoted by Gasparri, op. cit., n. 764.

³ See Gasparri, loc. cit.

⁴ Genesis ii. 24.

⁵ Wernz, op. cit., n. 410.

As regards the other degrees in the direct line, some¹ maintain that these are by the natural and Divine positive law a barrier to marriage, just as are the ties between parents and children. But many others, with St. Thomas, maintain that marriages between the people in question are not banned as absolutely unthinkable and grossly immoral in themselves, but are merely forbidden by human ordinance, because of the indelicacy and impropriety which would beyond all question attach to them.² While others, again, contend for a prohibition of the natural law as regards those in the direct line who are rather closely related, but do not insist on this between remote ancestors and their descendants. But at any rate, marriages between the latter classes are effectively enough forbidden by the natural law, which brings death to us all within a limited span of years.

The question as to the source of the impediment in the first degree of the collateral line is of more interest. I say the first degree, for it is unquestionable that the other relations in this line are outside the ambit of the Divine law—natural or positive. And authorities are sharply divided in opinion as to whether the invalidating force of the impediment as between brothers and sisters comes solely from the Canon law or has a higher source and sanction. One opinion³ which Gasparri⁴ favours is, that though there would be a natural impropriety or indecorum in such near relations getting married, yet these alliances cannot be banned by the natural law, for, if they were, the children of Adam could not have got married, nor could Abraham have married his sister. Neither, they argue, is there any prohibition of the Divine positive law, for Leviticus xviii. has been repealed, and there is no legislation on the subject in the Gospel. Others⁵ admit that it cannot be maintained that the natural law covers such alliances,

¹ Wernz, loc. cit.

² See St. Alphonsus, *Theol. Moralis*, l. vi. n. 471.

³ It is held by Schmalz., lib. iv. tit. xiv. n. 46.

⁴ Op. cit., n. 769.

⁵ Marc. n. 2019; Feije, n. 366.

but they assert that the positive Divine law does, and that it was merely dispensed from in the case of the children of Adam. While a third class¹ will have it, that the impediment is a rigorous precept of the natural law, and invoke on their side the universal testimony and practice of men. But so far as I can see, the attempts of these last mentioned authorities to get over the arguments from the Old Testament are not very satisfactory. Wernz, for instance, says that the immediate descendants of Adam were never included in this particular law at all. Nor does he see anything strange in this exemption, no more than in the exemption of one who is in extreme necessity from the natural law protecting property. For there is no intrinsic malice in the acts permitted in the one case any more than in the other; which, if I may say so with respect, looks like giving away his whole case. In regard to the difficulty drawn from the marriage of Abraham and Sara, he explains that the phrase 'daughter of my father' was used by the Jews to signify one with whom a person had only a grandfather in common.

The practice of the Church in the case of baptised converts who had married within the first degree should be a guide to determine the question. But, unfortunately, it is not easy to know what this practice is. Lehmkuhl² says that these are never allowed to continue conjugal relations after their conversion, and are allowed to contract marriages with strangers. If this be the case it is conclusive proof³ that these unions are barred by the Divine law; for, of course, before their conversion the Church law did not touch these people, and the ecclesiastical arrangement that Lehmkuhl suggests as existing, whereby their hypothetical conjugal ties are sundered the moment of their baptism or the moment after it, is, as Wernz says, entirely without proof or record.

¹ Wernz (n. 411) quotes for this view Sanchez, Suarez, Bellarmine, and Lugo.

² *Op. cit.*, n. 991.

³ If the civil legislature of the parties condemns these unions it might be held, of course, that the action of the Church could be explained by recognising the competence of the State to interfere in the case.

Gasparri,¹ however, emphatically denies that it is the practice of the Church to insist on the separation of the persons in question.

I must now say something as to what authority is to be approached by a parish priest when he is desirous of obtaining a dispensation for a parishioner of his.

By the common law of the Church it is only the Pope, and the venerable organs in Rome through which he exercises his authority, that can dispense in this or any other diriment impediment, and, of course, they only in so far as the prohibition is merely ecclesiastical. Consanguinity being of its nature a matter of public knowledge, competence to dispense in it resides, in ordinary circumstances, in the Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments. But if the relationship should chance to be secret and likely to remain so, a dispensation may be sought from the Sacred Penitentiary, which is authorised to deal only with the internal forum. When a priest or a lay person is seeking a favour of either of these bodies it is always well to present the petition through one's Bishop, who, if he approves of it, will forward it to the proper quarter, through his agent. Wernz² says the Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments will not grant the favour asked or, at any rate, will not grant it promptly, if it be not backed by the Bishop's recommendation. If the petition, having reference to matters of conscience, is intended for the Sacred Penitentiary, an obligation of secrecy may stand in the way of resort to the local authorities for their sanction. And in such a case, the petition may be forwarded to the agent in Rome by the priest, for submission to the Penitentiary, or this tribunal may be approached directly through the post; and in both instances the names of the persons for whom the favour is intended should be suppressed.

Except, however, in the case of those very closely related or through reasons of secrecy, application to Rome

¹ n. 772.

² n. 632, note (161).

is rarely necessary, for the Bishops have considerable delegated powers in this matter through quinquennial faculties.

Our Bishops have this authority through the *Formula Sexta*, the third number of which is as follows: 'Dispensandi in 3° et 4° simplici et mixto tantum in contrahendis; in contractis vero cum haereticis conversis etiam in 2° simplici et mixto, dummodo nullomodo attingat primum gradum, et in his casibus prolem susceptam declarandi legitimam.'

This power was extended by a declaration of the Propaganda in 1854, to cover 'matrimonia tum contracta tum contrahenda, idque pro matrimoniis tam Catholicorum quam eorum qui ab haeresi convertuntur.'¹ So that the Bishops, whether in the case of ordinary Catholics, or converts, who are their subjects, can dispense in the collateral line, unless the parties are as nearly related as first cousins—and this whether they have already attempted marriage or not. Moreover, if they be converts who were putative husband and wife before their conversion, they can be dispensed, even though they are first cousins.

The meaning of the terms *simplex* and *mixtus* in the concession was authoritatively decided on June 19, 1861, by the Holy Office, when it declared: 'Episcopus qui facultatibus gaudent formulae sextae posse dispensare in tertio et tertio, in quarto et quarto, necnon in tertio mixto cum quarto, sive gradus ab uno sive a duplici stipite proveniant.'

Accordingly, even if only one of the parties be in the second degree, that is to say, if they be first and second or first and third cousins, our Bishops have no authority to dispense, unless in the case of converts already married before their conversion. But it is quite immaterial whether or not they have two impediments owing to having come from two different stocks; and from other replies² of the same Congregation it is plain that their power is not

¹ See *Appendix to Maynooth Statutes*, p. 149.

² See Gasparri, n. 465.

restricted, even if the consanguinity be multiplied in any of the other ways I have mentioned already.¹

The Vicar-General and, *vi vocis*, the Vicar-Capitular have these powers of the *Formula Sexta* independently of the Bishop. And as the powers in question can be delegated to two priests in every city and important town of the diocese, and even to priests in country districts² where the size and character of the Catholic population would warrant this, it is to be presumed that Vicars-Forane have them also.

Of course if an impediment be doubtful *dubio facti*—not to mention a *dubium juris*—that is, if it be doubtful whether any relationship at all exists between the parties, or one within the forbidden degrees, the Bishop, by his ordinary power, can deal with the case and do away with the impediment completely, even should its existence subsequently become certain³; and notwithstanding the opinion of some, even should the impediment be public. The same is true of the Vicar-Capitular; but not of the Vicar-General, without special delegation, at least unless the Bishop be away and cannot easily be communicated with.⁴

There is no need to define the powers of a Bishop—whether these be called ordinary or quasi-ordinary—to dispense in danger of death; or if the impediment be occult, where some other grave reason exists; because, as a rule, it is not consanguinity that is the bar to a valid and legitimate union in such cases.

DAVID BARRY.

¹ See p. 353 *supra*.

² *Appendix to Maynooth Statutes*, p. 152.

³ See Wernz, n. 620, note (93).

⁴ Gasparri, n. 438.

SOME ASPECTS OF FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE

BY REV P. O'KEEFFE, M.A.

To the discerning mind the charm of Nietzsche, amid all his wilfulness and error, springs first from a hard, relentless logic, and then from a certain keenness of critical insight. He is a modern Thrasymachus, reproducing with almost pathetic fidelity the traits which Plato so delightfully sketched in the character of that ancient sophist. He makes no secret of his desire to shock us. And still his theory of morals contains in a sense a valuable stimulus for thought. For while your orthodox evolutionist, like Herbert Spencer, is eager to demonstrate the exact coincidence between evolutionary and Christian morals, to show us how our most refined convictions have arisen by 'differentiations and integrations' out of the conduct of the lower animals, Nietzsche establishes once for all their essential disparity. For him evolution means 'nature red in tooth and claw.' And this, from the standpoint of Christian morals, is a most valuable achievement, although Nietzsche would not have wished it so.

In another sense he strikes one as wildly illogical and exaggerated. And, no doubt, he is the immediate literary parent of those innumerable writers whose main desire seems to be to 'make our flesh creep,' who fancy that even truth acquires its just emphasis only when distorted by exaggeration and expressed in the form of error. But still, Nietzsche has a fine, if somewhat unbalanced, critical faculty. His judgments of philosophic systems are, at times, peculiarly convincing. And of individuals and nations and our modern civilisation generally, he is a

detached, if unjust, critic. Towards his own people, contrary to the prevailing opinion, he is curiously unsympathetic.

'The German soul,' he says, 'is, above all, manifold, varied in its source, aggregated and superimposed rather than built; but this is owing to its origin.'¹ They are a people made up of the most extraordinary mixing and mingling of races; they are hence more intangible, more ample, more contradictory, more unknown, more surprising than other peoples are to themselves. The German soul is a chaos, in fact it does not exist; it is becoming, developing itself. 'Development' is the essentially German discovery and hit in the great domain of philosophical formulas, 'a ruling idea which, together with German beer and German music, is labouring to Germanise all Europe.'

If anyone [he continues] wants to see the German soul demonstrated *ad oculos*, let him look at German taste and German art and manners; what boorish indifference to taste! How the noblest and the commonest stand there in juxtaposition. . . . The German drags at his soul, he drags at everything he experiences. He digests his events badly, . . . and just as all chronic invalids, all dyspeptics, like what is convenient, so the German loves 'frankness' and honesty. It is so convenient to be frank and honest.²

Nietzsche condemns in the most uncompromising terms the entire historical system of education of which Germany is proud. We think too much of the past and too little of the present. Without the power of thinking unhistorically there is no happiness and can be no action. History is good only to a man who is fighting a great fight, and who is in need of comforters and teachers he cannot find amongst his contemporaries. Even philosophy has been turned into the history of philosophy: 'a sort of harmless gossip between academic greybeards and academic sucklings.' He refers to what he calls the clumsiness and social distastefulness of the German scholars, to their psychical rope-dancing and nimbleness.

¹ *Beyond Good and Evil*, sec. 244.

² *Ibid.*

‘And, then, what a torture are books written in German to a reader who has a *third* ear. How indignantly he stands beside the slowly turning swamp of sounds without tune, and rhythms without dance, which Germans call a book.’ They will not recognise that there is an art in every sentence. They have no ear. They read not for the ear but only with the eye. All this is vigorous enough, but Nietzsche has quite a similar remark to make about the Englishman. ‘He has neither rhythm nor dance in the movements of his soul and body, no sense of music.’

Prussians, Nietzsche found peculiarly intolerable. He warns Germans not to barter too cheaply an old reputation for depth for Prussian ‘smartness and Berlin wit and sand.’ It is a peculiarly insidious touch when he suggests the advantages of inter-marriage between the Jews and the ruling Prussian class, especially the nobleman officer from the Prussian border.

It would be interesting in many ways to see whether the genius for money and patience (and especially some intellect and intellectuality, sadly lacking in the place referred to) could not in addition be annexed and trained to the hereditary art of commanding and obeying—for both of which the country in question has now a classic reputation.¹

The war of 1870 was such an unparalleled success that it tended to turn the heads of patriotic Germans. Everyone knew that the victory was due chiefly to the more extensive knowledge of the German officers, to the superior training and equipment of the soldiers, and to more scientific military strategy. But the German nation, says Nietzsche, soon began to glory in victory as the conquest of French by German culture. They were loud in their praises of Teutonic culture and the new Germanism. German journals, novels, tragedies, and poems were full of the new spirit.

Of all the evil results due to the last contest with France, the most deplorable, perhaps, is that widespread and even universal error of public opinion, and of all those who think publicly, that

¹ *Beyond Good and Evil*, sec. 251.

German culture was also victorious in the struggle, and that it should be now, therefore, decked with garlands, as a fit recognition of such extraordinary events and successes. This error is in the highest degree pernicious—because it threatens to convert our victory into a signal defeat. A defeat? I should say rather into the uprooting of the German mind for the benefit of the German Empire.¹

The truth is that German culture did not even help towards the success of German arms, for Germany has as yet nothing that can be called culture. 'To speak of German scholarship and culture as having conquered, therefore, can only be the result of a misapprehension, probably resulting from the circumstance that every precise notion of culture has now vanished from Germany.'² Those who have come into prominence are merely the 'Philistines of culture,' thinking they possess not only true culture, but the only true culture. It is merely barbarism fortified to the best of its ability, but lacking the freshness and savage force of original barbarism. 'We, Germans,' says Goethe to Eckermann, 'are of yesterday. No doubt in the last hundred years we have been cultivating ourselves quite diligently, but it may take a few centuries before our countrymen have absorbed sufficient intellect and higher culture for it to be said that it is a long time since they were barbarians.' Having learned much and knowing much are neither a necessary means to culture nor a sign of culture. German culture consists merely of hotch-potch, whereas France has long possessed a genuine productive culture. Nietzsche had a high opinion of French culture; he believed that the European *noblesse*—of sentiment, taste, and manners—was the work and invention of France; and that the European ignobleness—the plebeianism of modern ideas—was England's work and invention.

The intellectual decline of Germany Nietzsche attributes to the foundation of the Empire. For him the last hour of national culture is at hand. He speaks of the

¹ *David Strauss*, sec. 1.

² *Ibid.*

'morbid estrangement' induced by the nationality craze on the nations of Europe. Yet Europe wishes to be one.

There is an immense physiological process going on which is ever extending . . . the process of the assimilation of Europeans; their increasing detachment from the conditions under which, climatically and hereditarily, united races originate, that is, the slow emergence of an essentially super-national and nomadic species of man—who possesses a maximum of the art and power of adaptation as his typical distinction.¹

This is the evolving European—the 'Good European.' Germans must, then, resist the atavistic attacks of patriotism and soil attachment and become 'Good Europeans.' There is needed a new nobility, but certainly not a nobility that can be bought, nor a nobility whose virtue is love of country. 'No,' teaches Zarathustra, 'exiles shall ye be from your fatherlands and forefatherlands. Not the land of your fathers shall ye love, but your children's land. This love is the new nobility—love of that new land, the undiscovered far-off country in the remotest sea.' In the realm of music he finds fault with Schumann, because he was merely a German event and no longer a European event, as were Beethoven and Mozart. He had lost 'the voice for the soul of Europe,' and became merely a national affair. Even Wagner stooped to Germanism, and became a 'typical decadent.'

Indeed, it is in this respect that Germans sin most; in their, 'atavistic attacks of patriotism and soil attachment.' Any statesman who rears up for them a new Tower of Babel, some monstrosity of empire and power, they call great. 'They have entirely lost the breadth of vision which enables one to grasp the course of culture and the value of culture.' A man must first and foremost be German, he must belong to the race. Germany above all is a principle. They stand for the moral order of the universe in history; compared with the Roman Empire they are the upholders of freedom; compared with the

¹ *Beyond Good and Evil*, sec. 242.

eighteenth century they are the restorers of morality, of the Categorical Imperative.

As a matter of fact every great cause and culture for the last four centuries is on their consciences. The chief cause of the success of the Reformation was the uncultivated state of the nations of Northern Europe. They have divided up the nations of Europe into small States, with politics upon a municipal basis, and shoved them into a *cul-de-sac*. In matters of the spirit they grow every day more indolent, poorer in instincts, and more honest. 'They continue to diet themselves with contradictions, and gulp down Faith in company with Science . . . and the will to power (to the Empire) dished up with the gospel of the humble, without showing the slightest signs of indigestion.'

As he grew older Nietzsche's antipathy to all things German grew more complete. He could not bear to live in Germany, and was surprised that Schopenhauer ever succeeded in doing so. He went to reside near Berlin, for reasons of health, but left very soon because he could not put up with the inhabitants. He was overjoyed at the possibility of being able to prove that he was of Polish descent. 'It is part of my ambition,' he wrote, 'to be looked upon as a despiser of the Germans *par excellence*.' 'When I think of a type of man that runs counter to my instincts, a German always appears.'

Such a whole-hearted attack on the German nation is but a particular instance of an attack on the idea of nationality in general. Nietzsche attacks his own people because it is his own people he hopes to influence. The future or higher men would own no fatherlands. They would belong to a class of Supermen, not because they were born in a certain place or were descended from a certain family, but because they possessed the qualities which Nietzsche called by the general term 'noble.' He is just as severe on England. 'What is lacking in England is real power of intellect, real depth of intellectual perception, in short, philosophy. . . . The Englishman, more gloomy, sensual, headstrong, and brutal than the

German, is, for that very reason, as the baser of the two, also the more pious.’¹ ‘A penitential fit’ is the relatively highest manifestation of humanity to which they can be elevated. They are a nation of consummate cant. ‘Profound mediocrity and industrious carefulness are the chief characteristics of their great men. John Stuart Mill was a blockhead; Carlyle an unconscious and involuntary farce, the heroic moral interpretation of dyspeptic moods; Herbert Spencer the conceiver of a tea-grocer’s philosophy.

Nietzsche was dreaming of a united Europe. That Europe should be divided into separate nations, great and small, he considered a calamity. There was not a single idea behind all this ‘bovine nationalism,’ nothing but an arrogant self-conceit. The more profound and large-minded men of the present century belonged to fatherlands only in their old age, or in their moments of simulation. They only rested from themselves when they became patriots; such men were Napoleon, Goethe, Beethoven, Stendhal, Heinrich Heine, Schopenhauer. They were ‘the first artists of universal literary culture, born enemies of logic and the straight line; hankering after the strange, the exotic, the monstrous, the crooked, and the self-contradictory.’ How this united Europe was to be brought about is not clear. Nietzsche, in the matter of his own ideas, is a prophet, relying altogether on the immediate appeal of sweeping ideas.

There is needed, however, a new culture, a new education, radically opposed to the Philistinism at present in vogue. We want a ‘transvaluation of all values.’ This new culture imposes the duty of striving to produce, within one’s self and without, the thinker and artist, the lover of truth and beauty, the pure and good personality, and thereby striving for the perfection of nature. We must strive towards the elevating of the type man. Culture is the worship of genius, and a state of culture prevails when the men of a community are steadily working for the production of single great men. The duty of

¹ *Beyond Good and Evil*, sec. 252.

humanity is, then, not love of country but the production of solitary great men, for a nation is after all merely 'a roundabout way nature goes in order to produce a dozen great men.'

Nietzsche's moral system is an individualism pure and simple. The good comprises everything that increases the feeling of power, the will to power, power itself in man; the bad that which proceeds from weakness. Happiness is the feeling that power is increasing, that resistance is being overcome; not contentment but more power, not peace but war, is the ideal. The weak and helpless are going to the wall, and let us help to push them. Pity, sympathy with suffering, feeling for the weak are all immoral. 'We must become hard.' Our present morality is the morality of the weak, conceived for their benefit: what we want is the master's morality—the morality of power, courage, hardness, of hate for weakness; the morality which prefers war to a dishonourable peace. And so we go on from species to superspecies, on to the higher man, the Superman. 'I teach you the Superman. Man is something that must be surpassed.'

All this is merely the application to morality of well-known theories of Moral Evolution. Nietzsche was not so much an original as a logical thinker, for very little of the groundwork of his philosophy was in any way peculiar to himself. He simply accepted the theories which were the common property of the thinkers of his time, but he showed more courage in the working out of logical conclusions. The most popular and widely-accepted idea of the time was that of Evolution. This Nietzsche takes as the basis of his theory of morals. Herbert Spencer had already worked out a system of Evolutionary Ethics on an imposing scale, and he might well have arrived at conclusions similar to those of Nietzsche, had he not really started at the wrong end. Moral philosophers all ways regarded the established moral code as fixed, and their various moral theories were but so many means of justifying it. For Nietzsche nothing was established, nothing

fixed; so that any line of action, however sacred, which was not justified by his principles he had no hesitation in condemning. For Herbert Spencer the goal of Evolution was the survival of the fittest, and yet, by a series of ingenious arguments, he found place in his moral code for sympathy and altruistic feelings. Nietzsche was of opinion that on any logical theory of Moral Evolution such feelings stood condemned. An examination of the moral systems and the moral practice of his time convinced Nietzsche that, in spite of Evolution, the weak were really the masters of the strong, whereas justice was evidently the interest of the powerful. He saw that, from the standpoint of Evolution, there was needed a new morality, a new nobility, a transvaluation of all values. So far morality had been worked in the interest of the slaves, whereas Evolution demanded a master's morality. The slaves or the weak are, from the point of view of Evolution, also the bad; and it is our duty to see that they do not survive. In general terms a man's moral obligation consists in promoting in every way the process of Evolution. All this is very bad Christianity; but granted a theory of Moral Evolution, and it may be exceedingly good logic.

One of the characteristics of the future men will be their love of war. War is, in fact, one of the chief means of bringing into existence great men, and Nietzsche would consider it progress even if the rearing of a higher type or species meant the sacrifice of masses of such men as we know. 'A ruling race can only arise amid terrible and violent conditions.' He desires war, not for the fantastic redemption of the world, not for the spread of the German Empire (for such always means the ruin of culture), but in order that manliness may not cease to exist. 'When the instincts of a society make it give up war and renounce conquest it is decadent: it is ripe for democracy and the rule of shopkeepers.'¹ For 'the maintenance of the military State is the last means of adhering to the great tradition of the past, or where it has been lost to revive

¹ *Will to Power*, Aph. 728.

it. By means of it the superior or strong type of man is preserved.'¹

After the great war which must come, he says, the question will be—whether by that time it has been possible to train or rear a sort of caste of pre-eminent spirits who will be able to grasp the central power? War is a means of strengthening the strong and paralysing the weak, a means to the rearing of a higher type of man, the Superman. That such is the object of any form of modern militarism is not at all likely, and that the so-called lust for empire should have been fostered by Nietzsche's glorification of war seems too ironical even for history.

In his own country Nietzsche's influence was slight. His books seldom found a publisher, and practically never a critic. Of one book he had printed but forty copies, and could find barely seven friends to whom he could send it. He was a man with a genius for enmity rather than for friendship, as his relations with Wagner showed. In his writings we discern growing traces of his future insanity, but his madness, it must be admitted, always had a method in it. Even amidst his wildest and most savage views we observe the keen and ardent thinker, but he remained always a great solitary, a 'philosopher of the mountain peaks.'

P. O'KEEFFE.

¹ *Will to Power*, Aph. 729.

THE VICEROYALTY AND CATHOLIC DISABILITIES

BY FRANK MACDONAGH

THE quaint ceremonial in Dublin Castle on February 18, when Lord Wimborne was sworn in before the Privy Council as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, was marked by one of those incidents which show how some of the high offices of State are still hedged round by the penal code. Every schoolboy knows of the curious anomaly in British law that the chief executive office in Catholic Ireland cannot be administered by a Catholic, whilst it may be held by a man who is not even a Christian. Furthermore, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, as a Catholic, though holding the highest judicial office in the country, and thereby the leading confidential adviser of the Lord Lieutenant, is debarred by his religion from taking his rightful place with the Lords Justices when the oaths of office are administered to a new Viceroy. One of the relics of penal proscription is that the Lords Justices, who act as chief governors in the absence of the Lord Lieutenant, must be Protestant. A strange survival, it has attracted wide attention in view of the episode referred to; the more so as the function for which the Lord Chancellor is disqualified as a Catholic can be legally performed by any of his Protestant subordinates on the judicial bench who are members of the Privy Council. A few words here may be added in allusion to the Lords Justices. Of the many anomalies in the law and custom of the Constitution, one of the most ludicrous in the Irish system is that, whenever the Lord Lieutenant finds it necessary to cross to London, even for a day, Lords Justices are

appointed for the discharge in his absence of imaginary duties, announced officially as 'carrying on the government of the country.' Now, his Majesty the King, whom the Lord Lieutenant represents, may visit the battlefields in France and Belgium, or, in the piping times of peace, spend a long holiday in a foreign country, without the appointment of any such functionaries as Lords Justices to take his place. However, so long as Lords Justices continue to play a part in connexion with the Viceroyalty, superfluous though that part may be, the religious restriction governing their appointment must always be exceedingly obnoxious to Catholics, more especially to those of the Faith who are Privy Councillors, and who thus find themselves in a very marked manner placed beyond the Pale.

Though the axe of reform has been applied with considerable effect to many branches of the Irish upas tree in the last two generations, there are some boughs which continue to bloom in all their native strength, just to show that the old spirit of ascendancy still exists. Many efforts have been made in and out of Parliament to supplement the measure of emancipation with which the name of O'Connell is imperishably associated. It is now nearly fifty years since first a Bill proposing to allow a Catholic to be either Lord Chancellor or Lord Lieutenant of Ireland was received by a singular degree of assent by leaders of both the great English parties, and passed the second reading in the House of Commons by a large majority. The Chancellorship was soon afterwards opened to Catholics, the first appointment made being that of Lord O'Hagan; but when the measure was under discussion in Committee the proposal with reference to the office of Viceroy was struck out by a very small majority. The way had been paved, however, for that Bill by one introduced some years earlier by Sir William Somerville (afterwards Lord Athlumney), best known as the Irish Chief Secretary, in Lord John Russell's Administration, who had to deal with the great Famine and the Young Ireland Movement. In 1859 he

brought in a Bill for the purpose of removing the legal disabilities which debarred Catholics from the Irish Chancellorship. It was thirty years exactly since the Emancipation Act, and it only then leaked out that when Sir Robert Peel proposed that measure he was under the impression that the Irish Chancellor, like the English, had the distribution of Church patronage. Here was an extraordinary admission made by a great authority, Sir George Lewis, showing the grave error into which the famous Tory leader had fallen, and one that deprived Catholics for fully a generation from holding the highest judicial office in the country. The revelation had the effect of winning wide support for the Bill, the leaders of all parties supporting it; but, after reference to a Select Committee, it was withdrawn on account of the late period of the session and lacking, as it did, the sanction of a Government measure. It may be noted that in this year was passed the Act for the emancipation of the Jews, and similar restrictions were imposed regarding the holding of certain high offices, as in the case of the Catholics thirty years earlier. The Nonconformists, it will be remembered, were emancipated by the repeal of the Tests Act in 1828, when all penalties against Dissenters were removed, but the same course was not adopted in the following year with reference to the Catholics.

It was not until 1867 that the subject again came up for Parliamentary review. The man to bring it forward, Sir Colman O'Loughlen, was, appropriately enough, member for Clare, and the son of the first Catholic that was ever placed on the judicial Bench from the time of the Revolution. A great advance was made since 1859, as it was now proposed not only to make Catholics eligible for the office of Lord Chancellor, but also for that of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The debate was naturally on a very high plane, the Bill involving serious constitutional questions and the opening up of the whole subject of religious equality. While the chief Parliamentary defenders of the *status in quo* were that ineffable pair, Messrs. Whalley and

Newdegate, there was the usual outbreak in England of the Nonconformist conscience, in alliance with the Evangelical party, whose voices mingled in that loud 'bray of Exeter Hall,' which Macaulay's scornful phrase so aptly describes. Petitions were showered on all sections in Parliament, and every conceivable plea advanced that could in any degree bias the judgment of members. To claim the same toleration for Catholics as that acquired by other persuasions was a monstrous idea, and, as to opening high civil offices to those so long penalised, was regarded as a step towards getting rid of the Protestant succession to the throne! They appealed to the so-called securities inserted in the Emancipation Act, but would never dream of viewing them in the light afforded by subsequent experience and according to the exigencies of their own day.

Disraeli was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, and, as leader of the House, tried his best, in speaking for the Government, to be sympathetic. The conditions on which the Emancipation Act was passed were adapted to the time and circumstances with which the statesmen of that period had to deal, and he did not hold that they were foreclosed from revising the policy under which those arrangements were recommended to Parliament. He called attention, as did Sir George Lewis in 1859, to the great error on the part of Sir Robert Peel by the intrusion into the settlement of 1829 of the Irish Lord Chancellorship, declaring that there was not then, and never had been, anything in the office of Lord Chancellor which rendered it unfit that it should be held by a Catholic. When, however, the Tory leader came to deal with the Viceroyalty his attitude changed. His opposition rested on the question of the ecclesiastical patronage which, at that time, was exercised by the Viceroy in connexion with the Protestant Church in Ireland, and it rested, moreover, on the representation of the Crown by the Lord Lieutenant. It was evident that the religious and political prejudice aroused in various parts of England, and which found expression at the time in the intolerant cry, 'No Irish need apply,'

had its terrors for Disraeli, as the Government's tenure of office was then somewhat insecure. On that point Gladstone took the opportunity of reproaching him, and said it would be most unworthy of them to give weight to the prejudice of the country as against the civil rights of a people who were not English but Irish.

In discussing the reasons put forward why the Viceroyalty of Ireland should be regarded as one of the distinguished offices to which a Catholic could not legitimately aspire, Gladstone, in his own forcible style, brushed all objections aside. One of the reasons advanced was that the repeal of the particular clause in the measure would give rise to much debate and dissatisfaction. But, he pleaded, we sit here for the purpose of sifting those questions, and bringing mere feelings, mere instincts, mere prejudices to the bar of reason; and if it should be shown that there was no sound or satisfactory ground for treating those offices as an exception, or for stopping what, in the application of a principle, was now consecrated by the adhesion of all parties with respect to the disposal of civil offices, then, he said, the very confidence which their constituents reposed in them required them to go fearlessly forward, and to do that which was reasonable in itself, trusting to the good sense of the people of England to recognise the wisdom of their conclusions. The Liberal leader then went on to examine the question of the constitutional responsibility of the Lord Lieutenant, which he regarded as inferior in dignity and weight to that of the ministers forming a Cabinet. Some speakers tried to establish some connexion between the Protestant character of the Sovereign and the Protestant character of the Lord Lieutenant. The Lord Lieutenant, said Gladstone, is nothing more or less than one of the numerous wheels of government, subject to the same impulsion and the same control as the other wheels in the constitutional system. The Viceroy was not an independent agent, acting apart, untrammelled by responsibility of Parliament or by the directions he may receive from the Cabinet.

But, more than that ; who is the man in the Cabinet, asked the Liberal leader, whose duty it is, as the organ of the Government, to direct the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland ? Why, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, an office open to the just ambition of Catholics, and the law as it stands, while it prohibited a Catholic from attaining to the office of Lord Lieutenant, permitted a Catholic to hold the office which would make him, in a political sense, the master of the Lord Lieutenant.

Here it may be noted that the position of affairs adumbrated by Gladstone actually presented itself twenty years later. A Catholic, and an early supporter of Isaac Butt in the Home Rule Movement, Mr. Henry Matthews (later Lord Llandaff), became Home Secretary in Lord Salisbury's Administration in 1886, and held that high office during the Viceroyalty of the late Lord Londonderry, and of his successor, the Earl of Zetland. By this time the details of the administration of Ireland had become too important to rest altogether under the wing of the Home Office. There were still, however, important matters that called for direction from that department, the period being remarkable for some of the fiercest struggles in the movement under Parnell, and which of necessity again brought the Home Office into relations with Dublin Castle. Since those exciting years the official connexion of the Home Office with the government of Ireland has ceased, and its concern with this country is now mainly in the direction of factory labour.

Though the Chief Secretary is practically now the ruler of Ireland and directs the Lord Lieutenant, the principle stated so strongly by Gladstone in 1867, and again in 1872 by the then Home Secretary, Mr. Bruce (later Lord Aberdare), that there was no reason why the Irish Viceroyalty should not be held by a Catholic, has lost none of its force, inasmuch as the Chief Secretary himself may be a Catholic. The chief argument in the debates of 1867, that the Viceroy had ecclesiastical functions to perform and was the adviser of the Prime Minister in regard to the

selection of Bishops, was swept away by the disestablishment of the Irish Protestant Church. Apart from that, the same principle applied to the Lord Lieutenant as in the case of the Home Secretary. The latter also exercised ecclesiastical functions, as a matter of business in his department and without reference to the Crown, but provision was made that in the case of a Catholic being appointed to the office, those functions should not be exercised by him. That principle was also subsequently applied to the case of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. It was argued by Gladstone that the provision which was satisfactory in respect of the Home Secretaryship and the Irish Lord Chancellorship would likewise be satisfactory in the case of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He was, therefore, not prepared, he said, to stand in the face of the people of Ireland, of whom the vast majority belonged to the Catholic religion, and impose on the professors of that religion any disability which he was not able to justify, and which he could not maintain by strong and cogent reasons. There were, he added, no such reasons in the case they had before them. In fact, as the *Times* declared when the second reading of Sir Colman O'Loughlen's Bill was carried by a majority of 102, no tangible reasons were urged for maintaining the restrictions, and the only objection appeared to arise from the prejudice against investing Catholics with offices of so much dignity and importance in the very country where their religion had been most systematically repressed. When the House of Commons considered the Bill in Committee the clause with reference to the office of Lord Lieutenant was struck out, on a vote, by the very narrow majority of 3, while that relating to the Irish Lord Chancellorship was agreed to.

The next stage in the Parliamentary history of the subject of the Viceroyalty and Catholic Disabilities was reached five years later, in 1872. The old armoury of the opponents of Catholic emancipation were once more furbished up. Those zealots would maintain for all time the pains and penalties imposed by enactments that

possessed no sanction, and which they were too blind by prejudice to see were contrary to humanity and truth. The usual petitions were sent up to Westminster, expressing 'the alarm pervading all classes,' when Sir Colman O'Loghlen again brought forward his Bill. He sought to remove the restrictions in the case of Jews as well as Catholics, to place them in the same position as Nonconformists, and so capable of holding all offices under the Crown. The inclusion of the Jews in the Bill was a tactical move. The then English Solicitor-General, a very eminent lawyer and a Jew, was Sir George Jessel, who subsequently became Master of the Rolls. With the prospect in view of reaching the Woolsack as Lord High Chancellor of England, he made a minute study of the old statutes dealing with religious disabilities, and had come to the conclusion that there was no positive enactment against Catholic or Jew. Sir George Jessel took no part in the debate, but found an opportunity of communicating with some of the Irish members, to whom he gave it as his opinion that the last Oaths' Bill, in its strict constitution, *did* open the two great offices of Lord Chancellor of England and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to Jews and Christians equally. It leaked out also that the Attorney-General, Sir John Coleridge (later Lord Coleridge, Chief Justice of England), held a similar view to that of his fellow Law Officer.

Meanwhile, the debate was carried on, fortified by new arguments. On the previous occasion a Conservative member for Dublin, Mr. Pim, who, though a Protestant, warmly supported the Catholic claims, pointed out that when the Bill was passed for the Confederation of the North American Provinces, no one thought of proposing any restriction on the religion of the representative of the Sovereign in Canada. Both countries were Catholic, but there was no restriction in the case of the Canadian Governor. Mr. Pim put it to the Scotch members—what would be the feelings of the people of Scotland if a representative of the Sovereign were living in the old palace

of Holyrood, and the law provided that that representative should not be a Presbyterian ? Sir John Gray was able to present a stronger case. In India a Catholic, a Moham-medan, a Hindoo, or even a person of no religious belief whatever, might be made Viceroy, and exercise a much larger authority than was possessed by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It had been declared by Queen Victoria that she accepted the throne of India on the principle that every man who was a subject of India should be free and unfettered in his religious opinions, and that no man, because of those opinions, should be excluded from civil offices for which his merits qualified him. It is interesting to note, in connexion with Sir John Gray's observations, that when Gladstone came into power again in 1880 he included in his Government a Catholic, the Marquess of Ripon, as Viceroy of India. The event was signalised—in conjunction with the appointment of another Catholic peer, Lord Kenmare, to an office (that of Lord Chamberlain) closely associated with the Sovereign—by loud and angry protests from diverse parts of Great Britain. When, six years later, Mr. Henry Matthews was included in Lord Salisbury's Government as Home Secretary it was recorded as a satisfactory illustration of the growth of tolerance that the appointment should have passed without a Protestant murmur.

On the second reading of the Religious Disabilities Bill an amendment for its rejection was moved, but Sir Colman O'Loughlen, to avoid defeat, talked out his own measure. The Home Secretary, Mr. Bruce, who represented the Government, wished the Bill withdrawn, but said that if obliged to vote he should support the proposal to open the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to Catholics ; and that, with respect to the proposal to repeal the clauses of the Emancipation Act affecting Jesuits and Monastic Orders, such a law seemed to him the relic of a barbarous time. The debate now stood adjourned, and with the information at his command, Sir Colman O'Loughlen took an early opportunity of questioning the Attorney-General

on his view of the law as already alluded to. Accordingly, on May 2, 1872, he asked Sir John Coleridge if a Catholic or a Jew could be Lord Chancellor of England or Lord Lieutenant of Ireland? The Attorney-General, in his reply, made an elaborate statement in which, in a close study and analysis of the various statutes, he declared that, in his opinion, they could hold either office legally. He added, however, that his view of the law could scarcely be acted on till legislation gave that view confirmation by a declaratory statute. Upon receiving that answer, Sir Colman allowed the adjourned debate upon the second reading to be removed from the orders of the House, and the Bill was, therefore, withdrawn.

The subject then went to sleep in Parliament for another generation. A few years ago, however, it was heard of again in a measure sponsored by Irish Nationalist members. In addition to throwing open the Lord Chancellorship of England and the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland the Bill would also confer a full legal status on Catholic Religious Orders in the United Kingdom. As in the case of the other measures reviewed, it did not make any progress, and its fate added one more to the many illustrations how slowly matters move at Westminster and the utter powerlessness, at times, of the legislative machine.

It is lamentable to think of that long rosary of years and of the labours of Irish members in what, after all, proved a very fruitless task. The so-called concession in regard to the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland (and it must be remembered he is still deprived, as a Catholic, of his place with the Lords Justices at the Privy Council) was, of course, no concession at all, for, as we have seen, it was a grave mistake on the part of Peel and his advisers to have the chief legal position of the country included in the disabling clauses of the Emancipation Act. As to the Viceroyalty, it is now provided, by the Government of Ireland (Home Rule) Act, that 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any Act, no subject of his Majesty shall be disqualified to hold the office of Lord Lieutenant of

Ireland on account of his religious belief.' It has been stated in the English *Law Times* that the question as to whether a Catholic could now lawfully be appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland actually exercised the minds of the leaders of the Bar recently, both in England and Ireland, because of the original intention to appoint an Irish Catholic peer, Lord Granard, to the office, in succession to the Marquess of Aberdeen. No doubt, the Law Officers came to a similar conclusion as that recorded in 1872 in the statement of Sir John Coleridge. Ministers of the Crown have at times difficult tasks to face, and while it is generally felt that the last vestiges of religious disability ought now to be swept away, they have still to defend the indefensible on the ground that a reform involves so many consequences. Apart, however, from the Home Rule Act, and its belated provision regarding the Viceroyalty, it is surely time that Parliament repealed those musty disabling statutes affecting not only the Lord Chancellorship of England and the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, but, what is of far more importance, the Religious Orders of the kingdom. The passage of a distinct measure of this character would, indeed, be a complete renunciation of Protestant ascendancy.

FRANK MACDONAGH.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ART

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PAINTING IN ITALY

BY REV. E. A. FORAN, O.S.A.

IF we follow the history of painting from the early centuries of the Christian era down to the glorious period of the Renaissance we shall see how far its greatest triumphs were due to the influence and the patronage of the Catholic Church. Down through all the centuries of her career the Catholic Church has exercised a profound and world-wide influence in the whole domain of the arts. Poetry, music, painting, architecture, and sculpture, all of which appeal so forcibly to the higher aspirations of human souls, she enlisted in the services of the Faith and utilised as a means towards the refinement of Christian feeling and the advancement of Christian thought. In every land and in every age she fostered, encouraged, and cultivated the arts; whilst her dogma, her history, and her legend furnished the sources from which genius drew its noblest inspirations. In the sublime and solemn beauties of her liturgy and in the grandeur and magnificence of her cathedrals where, through fretted vault or 'long drawn aisle,' float the mystic harmonies of poetry and music and where gems of pictorial art and sculpture proclaim the glories of the Faith, we find the greatest of artistic achievements.

Studying the culture and development of art we touch upon a theme which carries investigation back to the days when the early Christians laboured to raise up the temple and the altar of the true God and to establish upon the ruins of paganism the dynasty of the Cross. Art, as the

Church found it in those early days, was essentially pagan. It had reached the apogee of its perfection in giving life and realism to the divinities of paganism and was still employed in idolatrous uses throughout the vast empire of the Cæsars. The Church was fully conscious of the æsthetic influence of art and of its potent aid in the propagation of religious thought, but, because of its pagan character at this period, she was forced to assume an attitude of hesitancy and precaution in adopting it in the services of Christianity. Moreover, in the early Christian communion there was a strong Semitic element, with deeply-rooted prejudices towards all kinds of images and graven things; an element which constituted an authoritative factor in all momentous decisions affecting her destinies in those days. This prejudice may be added to the reasons for the precaution shown by the Church, as well as for the restrictions placed upon the early attempts of the Christian artist; whose work was confined to a simple decorative symbolism. Nevertheless, in this simple symbolical art we can trace the germ of a great development that was to mature in time.

The Catacombs became the refuge and shelter of the early Christians during the pagan persecutions, and amongst the vast labyrinth of passages it became necessary, from time to time, to excavate large chambers, in order to accommodate at the divine services the ever-increasing numbers of the faithful. Portions of the mural fresco decoration of these chambers, which was carried out with a certain dignity and grandeur of style, are still preserved, and enable us to study the extensive symbolism employed by the early Christian artist. Mural fresco decoration was common in those early centuries, and whilst it was employed in the sacred places of the Catacombs it was not altogether free from pagan conventionalism, for we find introduced into a symbolism of a purely Christian character subjects from pagan mythology, such as Cupid, and Psyche, and the Apollo attracting the animals with his lyre. But archæologists assume that the Cupid and

Psyche were introduced as the symbols of eternal love, whilst the Apollo represented Christ attracting all mankind to Himself.

In the course of years, as the Church felt assured of the safety of her foothold in the empire and saw the triumph of the Faith established in the heroism of her martyrs, she allowed the artist to indulge more freely his artistic instincts and to advance into a more definite field of development. In the third century there was a relaxation of the early restraints, and the artist essayed to paint the first pictures of the Madonna and Holy Child, and to attempt the sacred portraiture of the Saviour. The most interesting specimens of the art of this period are to be found in the Catacombs of St. Calistus and St. Ponziano at Rome. Upon the walls of a large chamber in the Catacombs of St. Calistus are the remnants of various pictures that date back to the third and fourth centuries. They represent the Blessed Virgin and Holy Child, the raising of Lazarus, Daniel in the lion's den, and the Ascension of Elijah. Upon the ceiling of the same chamber, in a medallion surrounded with arabesques and doves, there is a picture of the Saviour which would illustrate very accurately the details given in the letter of Lantulus to the Roman Senate, describing the appearance of Jesus Christ. This and a corresponding picture in the Catacombs of St. Ponziano, though defective in execution and design, and though partly obliterated through the decay of time, bear a pathetic charm and interest for Christians, for they evidently represent the Saviour of mankind according to the traditional idea of His personal appearance, whilst they have established that definite type of countenance which has been followed by artists of succeeding generations.

Owing to the trials that encompassed her in those early centuries the art fostered by the Church failed to attain to any high degree of perfection, but on the general recognition of Christianity under Constantine in the year 313, a new impetus was given to its development. Coming

forth from the seclusion of the Catacombs, to breathe the air of security and freedom, her hands were soon busy in raising up new places of worship, in the construction of which she employed the best talent of the empire. Artists from Antioch, Alexandria, and Byzantium flocked to Rome, which had now become the recognised centre of Christendom. Their Eastern methods became predominant; and mosaic, which hitherto had been employed in decorative pavement work, was applied extensively to give splendour to altar and cupola and to portray picture subjects along the walls of the sacred buildings. During the century succeeding the emancipation of the Church Rome continued to be the centre of artistic activity, and no effort was spared to render the new basilicas in keeping with the grandeur and solemnity of sacred liturgy.

In the year 403 the Imperial Court was transferred to Ravenna, and that city became the capital of the West. Artists, whose genius had brought them into prominence in the Eternal City, were attracted thither by the extensive works set on foot there by the Church and the State. During the pastoral regime of the saintly Bishops Ursus, Agnellus, and Ecclesius there arose the Basilica and Baptistery of Ravenna, the Churches of St. Agata, St. Celsus, and St. Nazarius, and the Church of St. John the Baptist, in the decoration of which mosaic was very extensively employed. In the new imperial city artists were allowed full indulgence for their ideals, with the result that they concentrated their energies on the production of a variety of sacred and historical subjects, in the treatment of which there appeared a richness and an originality that was new to the art of the preceding centuries. The remarkable progress of the arts at Ravenna gave rise to the greatest rivalry between the artists of that city and of Rome; and whilst the munificence of Emperors and Popes lent them every encouragement in their work, the lingering vitality of the artistic spirit of ancient classic days seemed to have been revived. The magnificent mosaics executed in the Eternal City in the fifth and sixth centuries, especially

those preserved in the Churches of St. Paul, SS. Cosmo and Damiano and Sta Maria Maggiore equal in splendour and ideal the famous mosaics of the Basilica of Ravenna. During the reign of the Theodosian and Ostrogoth monarchs Ravenna continued to be the chief centre of artistic enterprise, and it is to the Catholic Church that the world is indebted for the preservation of the mosaics, the illuminated MSS., the rich ivory carvings, the wonderful textile fabrics, and sacred vessels which were the products of human genius in that city in those far-off days.

The fanatical outbreak of the Iconoclasts in the eighth and ninth centuries brought lamentable ruin to the early Christian art of the East. Venerable churches, dating back to the first centuries, which had been beautified beyond description through the patient energy of generations of artists, were stripped of their magnificent sculpture and mosaics; an act of sacrilegious desecration which was strongly condemned and deplored by the ecclesiastical authorities of the time. Powerless against the violence and brute force with which the Isaurian carried on his propaganda, the assembled prelates at the Council of Nicæa denounced him as the author of unpardonable outrage and sacrilege, and declared the mind of the Church with regard to the veneration of icon and image and the uses of art in religion. Pope Gregory, writing to the Isaurian, deplored the wanton destruction of those art treasures which had been held in such veneration by generations of Christians, and pointed out the importance of pictorial representations of religious and historical subjects to the uneducated. 'The picture was to the uneducated what the written word was to the educated.' But the Isaurian, who had imbibed the diabolical hatred of the Jews and Arabs towards religious pictures and images, was unrelenting. Heedless of the remonstrations of the Head of the Church, he carried his fanaticism to the bitter end in the East, emulating in his diabolical zeal even the notorious Caliph Jazed. He would have carried his warfare even to the very heart of Western

Christendom, had he not been checked by the Italian people, who made a determined stand to save from his sacrilegious hands their churches and that wonderful legacy of art with which their country has enriched the world.

Notwithstanding the paralysing effects of the Iconoclast movement it was succeeded in the following centuries by the golden age of Byzantine art. A new and vigorous development appeared throughout the East, and the great monasteries of Mount Athos, Thessalonica, and Constantinople became central ateliers of training, from which there went forth a host of artists, most of whom, historians tell us, were monks. Art students, also from every land, seem to have been attracted to the East, for the influence of this Byzantine revival can be traced in the Russian, Swedish, French, and Celtic art of the period. The methods and technique of the Byzantine school became universal, and nearly all the art that adorns our ancient and medieval churches is distinctly Byzantine in character.

Painting in tempera, on linen fabric, and on panels of wood was very extensively employed in the East during the early Christian centuries, but the destructive policy of the Isaurian spared only few examples of this art, and these are among the treasured icons of the Greek and Russian Churches. This method of painting, which was the heritage of Eastern artists, was again adopted in the great revival. It became extremely popular amongst Italians, to whom fresco painting appealed more forcibly than mosaic on account of the facility with which it lent itself to expression and feeling. The greatest triumphs of this golden age of Byzantine art are to be seen in the monumental churches of Daphni near Athens, St. Luke in Phocis, the Nea Moni of Chios, the palace church of Palermo, and the Church of St. Mark at Venice. These churches are unique in the richness and magnificence of their decorations, wrought in the brilliant and lasting mosaic.

The art of the Middle Ages was distinctly religious in its character. It might well be termed monastic art, for during that eventful epoch of the world's history the

monasteries were not only the homes and conservatories of ancient literature and scholastic culture, they were, moreover, the schools and academies of architecture, sculpture, and painting. In the cloisters the genius of art was studiously fostered and encouraged, and with the recluse rested the task of saving the art culture of the past as well as of supplementing its store, whilst the battle-cry of war hordes resounded through the plains and the cities of Europe. The great mass of illuminated MSS., the marvellous miniatures, the exquisite specimens of metal and enamel work that have been preserved, and which were once the treasured heirlooms of monastic institutions, bear eloquent testimony to the cultured and artistic industry of the various religious bodies.

It may be assumed that painting, during the Middle Ages, held only a third place with the sister arts of architecture and sculpture, and, later, when Neo-Germanic architecture became such a powerful incentive to new aspirations in neighbouring countries, and when there began to spring up those vast and magnificent cathedrals that are the glory of Christendom to-day, it is evident that works of such magnitude and importance must have absorbed all the best artistic talent and engaged all the original genius of the times. But whilst Germany, England, France, and Spain were vying with each other in the beauty and grandeur of their architecture, the ancient basilicas of Italy were being remodelled and restored, and a vast field of rivalry and endeavour was being opened up to the artist in fresco and mosaic.

The thirteenth century dawned auspiciously for painting in Italy. Innocent III had succeeded in restoring peace in the various neighbouring States, and in raising the Papacy to a degree of splendour and power unknown to his predecessors in the chair of St. Peter. To all the arts this Pontiff extended the generous guarantee of the wealth and influence of the Church, an encouragement that was speedily availed of by the aspiring Italian genius of the day.

The desire for more beautiful structures called for a more perfect and realistic art, and gave birth to new and more exalted ideals, the realisation of which became the dream of every artist. The marked characteristics of the Byzantine style appeared in all the art of the previous centuries; due to the influence of the monks of Mount Athos, whose panel paintings had found their way into every country of Western Christendom, as well as to the constant migration of Eastern artists who had kept Byzantine methods predominant; but, towards the close of the thirteenth century, the works of Western artists show evidence of an advance towards independence and originality of style and towards that distinct development which foreshadowed the art of the Renaissance. The mosaics of Toretì in the Church of Sta Maria Maggiore at Rome, and the frescoes of Cavallini in Sta Maria in Trastevere, are amongst the best works of this period of transition. They are examples of more natural grouping and of that greater freedom and correctness of design to which the artists of the period aspired, whilst they surpass in dignity and decorative beauty of composition the works of preceding centuries.

During this and the succeeding century the stir of a new artistic life had appeared in the northern Italian cities, and Guido da Siena, Giunta da Pisa, and Andrea Tafi, of Florence, did much towards laying the foundation of a national Italian art. They were followed by one of the greatest of Italian masters, Cimabue, the Florentine artist, who manifested wonderful powers of genius in the frescoes of the Church of Assisi. The character of the Seraphic Saint was the source of sublime inspiration to this artist. There is remarkable sentiment and beauty in his art, which he succeeded in bringing to a high state of perfection.

Contemporary with Cimabue was Duccio of Siena, whose painting for the high altar of the Duomo was borne in triumphant procession from his studio to its place in the church. His works are considered the best examples of original talent and of the 'first style of modern painting.'

But political dissension and domestic troubles at Siena brought a check to his great career. Kugler, in his history of painting, gives expression to the opinion that art had nearly attained to perfection in Duccio's works, and that but a short interval appeared necessary to add all that was required. Yet not until two centuries later did art attain its highest development.

Under the versatile genius of Giotto, the shepherd boy pupil of Cimabue, art made still further advancement. Through the able tuition of his patron, Giotto became a master of the technicalities of painting. He made an extensive study of contemporary art, and combined in his work all the perfections to which art had attained under his predecessors. He was of a poetic nature and beautiful poetic allegory appears in all his pictures. Poetic visions, such as those of his intimate friend, Dante, seem to have inspired the scheme of his allegorical pictures of poverty, chastity, and obedience, in the lower Church of St. Francis of Assisi. His paintings in the Church of the Incoronata at Naples are allegorical of the Sacraments, whilst his sculpture that adorned the famous Campanile of Florence consisted of allegorical subjects illustrating the development of human wisdom. His 'Navacella,' a magnificent mosaic executed for the old Basilica Church of St. Peter at Rome, is now preserved in the vestibule of the present Basilica. This great master travelled all over Italy, leaving the impress of his style upon the art of every city and creating a high ideal for his contemporaries and successors to follow. In all his paintings Giotto shows wonderful penetration of mind and a masterly skill in giving character and expression to his faces. He was accorded the first place in the esteem of both artists and art patrons in his day, and his works are to be met with in nearly all the great cities of Italy; but it is in the Church of Sta Croce, in Florence, that we find the richest and best preserved specimens of his art.

Perhaps the greatest triumphs of the Giottesque style were achieved in the decoration of the Chapel of Sta Maria

Novella, in Florence. This church was founded to commemorate the first festival of Corpus Christi, and the paintings that adorn it are allegorical of Divine and human wisdom. In one of those pictures St. Thomas, who had been recently canonised, holds a central place, on account of the part which he took in promoting the feast of the Blessed Sacrament. Amongst the pupils of Giotto, Teddio Gaddi became the most celebrated, the best examples of whose works are to be seen in the Florentine churches.

Towards the end of the fourteenth century and in the beginning of the fifteenth there was remarkable activity in the various Italian art centres, and a great number of celebrated painters appeared. Historians of the period lavish no little praise upon the Pisan masters, prominent amongst whom were Francisco de Volterra, Orcagna, Spinello, and Pietro de Lorenzo, whose pictures are remarkable for technical merit, harmony of colouring, and that serious feeling so essential to the treatment of sacred subjects. The chief representatives of the Sienese school were Simon Memmi and Lippo Memmi. After Giotto's death the former, who had sprung into great repute, was summoned to continue the work of Giotto at the Papal palace of Avignon. All the artists of this period benefited largely by the experience acquired by their predecessors, whilst they themselves added, in turn, something towards the advancement of their national art.

Amongst contemporary masters of the Florentine school were Don Lorenzo, commonly known as Il Monico, and Fra Angelico, who is considered one of the noblest characters in the history of Italian painting. Il Monico's pictures are remarkable for careful execution, and for clear and harmonious colouring. His greatest works are the Altarpiece painted for the abbey church of Correto and his 'Descent from the Cross,' which is now preserved in the Academia of Florence.

Fra Angelico's first attempts in art were in miniature painting and illustration, under the tuition of Benedetto de Magello, Prior of the Dominican Convent of Fiesole.

Fra Angelico entered the Dominican Order at an early age, and most of his life was spent in the monastery of St. Mark, at Florence. Recognising the fact that he had a special gift and vocation for art, his superiors allowed him every facility in his work, and so prolific were his artistic powers, that in nearly every gallery in Europe we meet with some specimen from his brush. Amongst his greatest masterpieces are those preserved in the Academia in Florence, his frescoes in the Cathedral of Orvieto, and his scenes from the lives of St. Stephen and St. Lawrence, painted in one of the stanzas of the Vatican. Indifferent alike to the remunerations which his beautiful pictures might command, as well as to the encomiums which his work might evoke outside the cloister, Fra Angelico painted solely for the love of art. Vasari tells us that he never painted for money, though he could have secured wealth and fame and have lived at ease by his brush. Following the bent of his own great genius, he developed a style peculiarly his own; but, considering his wonderful natural abilities, it cannot be said that he kept pace with contemporary painting. He adhered too rigorously to traditional types and, owing to the environments of monastic life, he was out of touch with the new progressive developments in the various Italian schools. We miss from his work those elements of improvement introduced into the art of the period by the closer study of nature and anatomy. The distinctive and characteristic charm of Fra Angelico's art lies in the deep sincerity of religious feeling which pervades his work, in the grace and beauty of his composition, and in the sweetness of expression which we find in all his faces. The one missing element of correct delineation, so obvious to the critical eye, is forgotten in the impression which one receives from his pictures. They possess that rare beauty of the *spirituelle*, which is the great enhancing charm of religious art.

From the last decade of the fifteenth century down to the meridian splendour of the Renaissance new names continued to be added to the roll of fame, and new triumphs to

be achieved in the whole domain of Italian painting. The extensive patronage of the Catholic Church, the ecclesiastical bodies and confraternities, was to the genius of art the vital spring of encouragement and hope, with the result that this period was productive of an enormous number of pictures. Verona, Siena, Milan, Venice, Pisa, Bologna, as well as Rome and Florence, had become centres of intellectual and artistic activity and had established their distinctive schools of painting. The names of Masaccio, Filippino Lippi, Sandro Botticelli, Cosmo Rosselli, Pietro Perugino, Benozzo, Gozzoli, Luca Signorelli—these and a host of other artists produced works of the highest merit, and are accredited by historians with having carried their art almost to the zenith of perfection, so that it needed but the colossal genius of Raphael and Michael Angelo to accomplish its noblest triumphs.

Period after period of art development had opened and closed with the lives of the great masters: Cimabue, Giotto, Fra Angelico, Masaccio, and Perugino; each period bringing some new element of improvement in technique, composition, or design; whilst, from century to century, the Catholic Church held her place as art's supreme guardian spirit, manifesting at all times the very deepest interest in every phase of its development. At times the artist carried his endeavours outside the pietistic circle of religious history and tradition, but it is within the pale of sacred painting that each artist has left the mark of his personal greatness, and accomplished work that links his memory with imperishable fame.

During the period of the Renaissance all the elements of improvement already introduced into painting were again ingeniously blended and skilfully applied, while a close study of anatomy and the antique became primarily essential to the knowledge of every art student who aspired to success. It was a period when the several schools had their distinctive groups, and when a number of highly gifted artists toiled with jealous rivalry, so that painting of a rare and exalted nature was the result, and

master works came forth from the Italian studios which will hold their places for all time amongst the greatest achievements of art. Every artist of ambition looked forward in those days to the time when the merits of his work could claim ecclesiastical patronage; for that coveted distinction was open only to superior talent and was, consequently, the object of the keenest contending. The best paintings of the Renaissance are almost exclusively religious, and no historian can fail to recognise the generous action of the Church in giving that opportunity for work which helped to bring out the diviner energies of human genius.

Art, for a time, seemed to have no single supreme representative, whose genius raised him above his fellows, until the three great masters of the Renaissance appeared, Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, and Michael Angelo.

Leonardo da Vinci, born in the middle of the fifteenth century, came early in the period of the full Renaissance, and holds one of the first places amongst the masters of modern art. He was endowed with an unparalleled versatility. A gifted writer, an accomplished musician, an architect, sculptor, and painter, his genius seemed to overshadow all others; but a sad fatality followed nearly all the works upon which he expended his energies. His greatest picture, a fresco of the 'Last Supper,' covering one of the walls of the convent refectory of Sta Maria delle Grazie, in Milan, was seriously injured during the inundations of the year 1500, and attempts at restoration resulted in its almost irreparable ruin. Some faithful copies executed by Da Vinci's pupils are extant, and from them we can form an idea of the incomparable beauty of the original. Da Vinci painted but little for the Church, and there is a dearth of authentic specimens of his art. He devoted more time to study than to practical work, but the work that came from his brush remains unsurpassed in excellence. He loved to mix with crowds, wherever there was prospect of excitement, making notes of the different phases of feeling and of expression, of attitude

and gesture. The knowledge thus acquired and used in such a masterly way in his pictures added a new and most enhancing charm to art. Da Vinci, owing to his activity in other fields, did not display the same industry in painting as his contemporaries, nevertheless no other artist of his time did more to carry the art of painting to its supreme degree of perfection.

Michael Angelo, born in 1475, was twenty years Da Vinci's junior. He was also a versatile genius, and immortalised his name in architecture, sculpture, and painting. In sculpture the 'Moses' of Michael Angelo is perhaps the noblest work in existence. Connoisseurs of the antique, in their admiration for ancient art, tell us that there is nothing in the world to compare with the Grecian Apollo, but beside the statue of Moses it is cold and impressionless. The Moses seems imbued with a powerful and supernatural vitality, which no other hand, except Michael Angelo's, has ever succeeded in imparting to marble.

The Sistine Chapel, in the Vatican Palace at Rome, contains the great paintings of Michael Angelo. Built by Pope Sixtus IV, in 1473, its walls were first covered with pictures by the artists of the early Renaissance—Perugino, Luca Signorelli, Sandro Botticelli, Cosmo Rosselli, Dominico Ghirlandajo, and Cecchino Salvati. Pope Julius II invited Michael Angelo to undertake the decoration of the ceiling. He commenced his work in 1508, and in an extraordinary short time covered the immense space with his incomparable frescoes. The chapel is 150 feet by 50, and the ceiling is vaulted with a flattened arch, along the centre of which he depicted a series of subjects from the Book of Genesis, illustrating the Creation and the Fall of Man. These pictures are contained within nine sections of beautiful architectural framework which breaks into angular spaces towards the part of the walls from which the vaulting springs. These spaces contain the majestic figures of the prophets who foretold to the Jews the coming of the Saviour and the figures of the Sibyls of the pagan world who prophesied His advent to the Gentiles. Lanzi, the

historian, speaking of these figures of the prophets, says : 'The dignity of their appearance, the solemn majesty of their eyes, a certain wild and uncommon casting of the drapery, and their attitudes, whether representing motion or rest, announce an order of beings who hold converse with the Deity, and whose mouths utter what He inspires.' In other angles there are pictures illustrating the genealogy of the Blessed Virgin, thus creating a connecting link between the Creation and the Fall of Man and the coming of the promised Redeemer. The subjects depicted in the central sections are : the Eternal Father sending the great orbs on their pathways through the heavens—touching the finger of the first man in order to awake him to life ; the Creation of Eve ; the Expulsion from Paradise ; the Deluge, and the Sacrifice of Noah. The whole idea is powerful and grand, the composition sublime, and the execution magnificent. After the completion of these frescoes, which placed Michael Angelo upon the highest pinnacle of fame, his patriotism led him back to his native Florence, where, during the succeeding twenty years, he devoted his energies to architecture and sculpture.

In his sixtieth year he returned to Rome, and was commissioned by Paul III to complete his work in the Sistine. Clement VII had conceived the idea of employing him to paint on the end walls of the chapel two pictures representing the Fall of the Angels and the Last Judgment. Michael Angelo had prepared the designs, but had laid them aside on the death of Pope Clement. His successor, Paul III, in order to entreat the great artist to carry out his plans, visited him at his home, accompanied by ten Cardinals, 'an honour, except in this instance, unknown in the annals of art.' Michael Angelo undertook the 'Last Judgment' and completed it in the year 1541. There is a peculiar tragic grandeur about this picture. It has extraordinary contrasts of joy and despair. With a power to impress, of which no human eloquence is capable, it depicts the terrible moment of judgment, when the blessed begin their flight towards the heavens and the damned are being

hurled downwards. Thus, in the Sistine Chapel, we find Michael Angelo's greatest works, the legacy of his noble genius to the Church which has preserved them to posterity. The last ten years of his life were spent at Rome. Immortalised in fresco and in sculpture his ambition was next centred upon architecture, and the great Basilica of St. Peter afforded him the opportunity which he needed to carry out the wonderful conceptions of his mind. He spent his last years in superintending the construction of the vast building, but he died before its completion. The most daring feat of architecture in the world is Michael Angelo's 'vast and wondrous dome.'

In this brilliant period of art Michael Angelo's greatest contemporary and rival was Raphael Sanzio, who was born in 1483. Both being of a versatile nature with an intimate knowledge of each other's great powers, these two masters took different courses in the pursuit of art—the one to excel in mighty frescoes and sculpture, the other to surpass in the incomparable beauty of his oil paintings. But, like his two great contemporaries, Raphael had a talent for sculpture, and produced some specimens of statuary, the best of which is his 'Jonah,' preserved in the Church of Sta Marie del Popolo at Rome.

Raphael was an admirable character. He was gentle and prepossessing, and was universally loved. Vasari tells us that 'nature and fortune united in lavishing their favours upon him—the first in investing him with the rarest gifts of genius, the other in adding to these a singular combination of propitious circumstances.' He had the rare advantage of being born in an artistic family, while he had the experience of the best masters of the period in colour and design to profit by. At the age of seventeen we find him already an accomplished artist, combining all that was excellent and beautiful in the works of his teachers and essaying into a rare and individual style. Before he was twenty years old he had produced several pictures, which, though not so perfect as his works at a later period, are yet to be classed amongst

the great masterpieces. One of these pictures which drew most attention to his art was the painting of St. Nicholas of Tolentine. This picture, so beautifully conceived and executed, and so greatly admired by his biographers, represented the Blessed Virgin and St. Augustine binding the temples of St. Nicholas with a crown, in the midst of a choir of angels.

At an early period Raphael began to excel his teachers and to overreach them in striving for the laurels of fame. The 'Marriage of the Blessed Virgin,' painted for the Church of St. Francis, in Castello, is a picture which is full of wondrous charm and sublime thought, and is the work that first brought the masterful art of Raphael into general recognition throughout the Italian cities. Pinturicchio, his master, kept Raphael as much as possible at his side, and we find them working together at Siena, in 1503, upon a series of paintings of great magnitude and importance. These represent the principal events in the life of Silvius Piccolomini, afterwards Pope Pius II: the different embassies with which he had been entrusted; the Canonisation of St. Catherine of Siena; the Council of Mantua; his subsequent elevation to the Papal dignity; his death and the removal of his remains from Ancona to Rome. Though Raphael had never undertaken historical subjects, and though he had little knowledge of the grandeur of European courts, he undertook this enormous task under the guidance of his master. Vasari tells us that it was Raphael who prepared all the cartoons and designs, and that his distinctive style is traceable throughout the entire scheme of the work.

After the completion of those paintings Raphael set out to visit the great centres of art. At Florence he became acquainted, for the first time, with the famous works of Leonardo da Vinci and Michael Angelo. Critics discover an advance and an improvement in his art during this visit to Florence, though he still retained all the originality of his distinctive style. All this time his great genius was most prolific. He painted a vast number of pictures,

all of which were for the most part commissions for ecclesiastics and for churches; but none of them have been left in their original places. They have been scattered throughout the world. One of those early pictures, St. Catherine of Alexandria, found its way to England, and is now in the National Gallery of London. A famous altarpiece of this period, the 'Madonna de Pescia,' is in the Pitti Palace of Florence, whilst another picture, painted for the Church of St. Francis, at Perugia, is now in the Borghese at Rome.

Raphael's masterly ability had already won for him recognition and admiration at Rome. He was called to the Eternal City by Pope Julius II, in 1508, just at the time when Michael Angelo was engaged on his frescoes, in the Sistine Chapel. Raphael knew that the opportunity of a lifetime was now opened to him. To be called to Rome was the highest ambition of every artist. He could now aspire to the laurels of the first painter of the day. On viewing the great works of Michael Angelo the spirit of emulation was aroused. He was cognisant of his own mighty powers, but he was not blind to the defects of his education; hence he set himself to acquire a knowledge of history, science, and poetry, and to study the works of Grecian genius and the ancient architectural remains of the Eternal City. Thus his mind received that culture which enabled him to treat with accuracy the noble works which he had in contemplation.

In the 'Camera della Segnatura' in the Vatican we find Raphael's first superb compositions illustrating the great sciences, Theology, Philosophy and Jurisprudence. In treating the subject of theology he seems to have followed the poetic vision of Petrarch, and with all the power of poetic genius, he introduces into his picture a most wonderful grouping of the great lights of theological science. The dignified figures of the Evangelists, whose volumes form the foundation of the holy science, are surrounded by the doctors and writers of the early centuries, and by saints and writers of modern times, such as St. Thomas, St.

Bonaventure, and Scotus. In the midst of this throng stands an altar upon which the Blessed Sacrament is placed, and above it, enthroned in cloud and surrounded by the blessed, is the Trinity, thus symbolising the two great mysteries which have engaged the minds of the theologians of Christendom.

Such was the surprise and the admiration evoked by this glorious work of art that the Pope ordered the other decorations of the vast hall to be destroyed, in order that Raphael's genius might have scope for other works. On the opposite wall he introduced the subject of Philosophy. In this marvellous painting he depicts a crowd of ancient and modern philosophers and scientists in most admirable grouping and dispersed through a hall of wonderful architectural design. Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Archimedes are the central and leading figures, amidst a throng of other personages famous at different epochs of history. They stand in various attitudes of attention, meditation, or in dispute, all imbued with a wonderful vitality and forming one grand majestic group. This picture is beautifully balanced ; the style is free and noble, and the whole arrangement of the immense work is dignified and grand.

In the same hall of the 'Segnatura' Raphael painted two other pictures, 'Poetry' and 'Jurisprudence,' in both of which he displays the same superb ability and depth of thought. In 'Poetry' Apollo and the Muses are seen reclining under laurel trees on the Parnassian heights and surrounded by allegorical groupings of the poets of ancient and modern times. Homer, an inspired and majestic figure, stands prominent with Virgil and Dante, and beside him, and dispersed in various attitudes in the foreground, are the figures of Horace, Pindar, Raphael's favourite poet, Petrarch, and a number of personages representing lyric poetry. The whole composition is admirably arranged and harmonised.

The companion picture, 'Jurisprudence,' is surrounded by impersonations of Fortitude, Prudence, and Temperance; the main composition representing Civil and Ecclesiastical

Law. Into this picture Raphael introduced extensive portraiture. His patron, Julius II, is seen handing decretals to a consistorial advocate, and is surrounded by prominent individuals of the Papal Court. The portraiture in this picture gives it the immense value of being one of the most important historical monuments of the period.

These great productions of Raphael, which were admired and praised by all Rome, brought him a rapid rise to fame. Michael Angelo had disappeared to Florence, so that he stood without a rival in the Eternal City. In order to retain him in the service of the Vatican the enormous sum of 4800 golden scudi were bestowed upon him from the Papal treasury, a sum which enabled him to live in opulence and to continue that mental culture upon which depended the future triumph of his art. Raphael's next great work was begun in 1512, in the camera of Heliodorus. The principal painting in this camera represents the miraculous expulsion of the plunderer, Heliodorus, from the Temple of Jerusalem, a subject taken from the Book of Maccabees, and symbolical of the Divine protection of the Church and of its deliverance from its enemies. The central figure in this picture is the High Priest Onias, kneeling in prayer before the altar of the Holy of Holies, whilst in the foreground is seen Heliodorus, with a group of Assyrians, being driven before a mail-clad warrior on horseback. This picture is a work of great poetic power, and contains an allegory of the zeal and authority of Julius II, who is introduced into the grouping.

The companion picture, and the last painted during the life of Julius II, is the miracle of Bolsena. It represents the celebration of a Mass during which the Sacred Host is said to have bled. Into this picture, which is considered to be a great masterpiece of colouring and composition, Raphael introduces his patron again, surrounded by a group of ecclesiastics, court dignitaries, and Swiss Guards, in their characteristic uniforms. During the painting of this picture Raphael's patron died. Some apparent coarseness in the finish is accounted for by the fact that Raphael,

after the death of Pope Julius, entrusted its completion to his pupils and assistants.

Under the patronage of Leo X Raphael continued the decoration of the camera of Heliodorus, with the result that the succeeding compositions are considered to be the most important of the whole series of works. The painting representing the deliverance of St. Peter out of prison is a masterpiece, in which Raphael manifests his great powers in the treatment of the effects of light. The dark interior of St. Peter's prison is lit up by celestial radiance emanating from the angel who is seen approaching through a railing. Outside the guards, who in alarm have lighted a torch, are seen in the moonlight, so that there is a wonderful triple effect of light. The picture is considered to contain an allusion to the deliverance of Leo X from the prison of Ravenna, where he had been held captive by the French in the year previous to his elevation to the Pontificate. The fourth great picture of Raphael in this hall is said to bear an allusion to the expulsion of the French out of Italy, which the Medici effected in 1513 with the assistance of the Swiss. The picture is called 'Attila,' and represents the great barbarian warrior with his army drawn up before the walls of Rome, and awaiting the approach of Leo I, who came to parley with him in order to induce him to desist from his hostile enterprise against the city. The Papal group is calm and restful, and the scene is full of animation, whilst in the foreground the restless host of Hunnish horsemen are splendidly portrayed. This vast picture, with its wonderful power and beauty, has met with less admiration amongst Raphael's critics than his other compositions.

Raphael's next paintings are in 'Stanza del Incendio' in the Vatican, the principal picture being the 'Burning of the Borgo,' a suburb added to Rome during the Pontificate of Pope Leo IV. The terrible conflagration which occurred there is said to have been miraculously extinguished by the Pope in making the sign of the Cross. A great variety of figures are introduced into this picture,

representing wild agitation, emotion, and passion. In this stanza there are other immense paintings representing the defeat of the Saracens at Ostia; Leo III taking the Oath before Charlemagne, and the Coronation of Charlemagne by Leo III.

Having completed these immense commissions Raphael undertook to decorate the vaulted arcade of the Court of St. Damascus, but he did little more than prepare the designs. Julio Romano and others of his pupils carried out the work, whilst Raphael was engaged in making his cartoons for the Sistine tapestries. The subjects for those great tapestries are taken from the Acts of the Apostles and the history of the early Church, in which Saints Peter and Paul are the central figures. These wonderful cartoons, which still exist, are amongst the greatest triumphs of Raphael's art.

Besides these great works at the Vatican, Raphael, whose genius was most prolific, produced an enormous number of other paintings for churches and for private benefactors. His 'Isaiah,' painted in the Church of St. Augustine, at Rome, is magnificent, and bears comparison with the great work of Michael Angelo in the Sistine. In his 'Vision of Ezekiel,' a medium-size oil painting, preserved in the Pitti Palace, Raphael has aspired to the sublime and holy in art. Kugler looks upon this as one of the noblest masterpieces of the world's art. 'In this little work Raphael is supremely great.' In the conception and composition of this picture he followed the original impulse of his noble mind, and it would seem that in this work he surpasses Michael Angelo. In Michael Angelo's painting in the Sistine the Eternal Father is borne on the storm. Raphael depicts the Creator seated upon the mystical forms of the ox, the eagle, and the lion, His outstretched arm upheld by Angels, and surrounded by celestial radiance, through which appear the myriad faces of the cherubim. There is nothing in art so dignified, so majestic, or so sublime.

The sweetness and beauty of Raphael's numerous

Madonnas and Holy Families have never been surpassed in any age. 'Those Madonnas enchant us,' says Mengs, 'not because they possess the beauty of the Medician Venus, but because in these wonderful productions he has personified modesty, maternal love, purity of mind, and the highest endowments of grace.' The 'Madonna di san Sisto,' which is in the Dresden Gallery, is considered by Raphael's biographers to be the most wonderful creation of his pencil outside of Italy. In this picture the Blessed Virgin is depicted in true queenly beauty as the exalted above all creatures, and the chosen of God. She stands amidst clouds, surrounded by a glory, which is filled with cherub faces. There is a wonderful sweetness in the Virgin's face whilst she and the Holy Child look out upon us with a gentle sympathy in their eyes. The kneeling figures of St. Sixtus and St. Barbara and two small angels complete the composition. The 'Madonna della Sedia,' a small circular picture in the Pitti Palace, is one of the most universally known pictures of Raphael, because of the numerous coloured prints of it which have been circulated throughout the world. In this the Holy Child is seen reposing gracefully in the maternal arms, St. John bending towards them with his hands clasped in prayer.

The 'Pearl' picture, in the gallery of Madrid, is considered by some connoisseurs to be unquestionably the first in excellence of his numerous 'Holy Families.' In harmony of colour and composition the picture is perfectly beautiful. Philip IV, having purchased it from the collection of Charles I, on first seeing it, is said to have exclaimed: 'This is my pearl'—hence the name.

The last picture of Raphael and the one, according to Mengs, which 'bears more excellence than any of his other works,' is the 'Transfiguration,' now in the Vatican Gallery. Before completing this picture Raphael was seized with a violent fever, from which he died on the Good Friday of the year 1520. It is a picture to which no description could do justice. Lanzi, speaking of it, says: 'The "Transfiguration" is a combination of all the artistic ideas of

majesty and beauty. It is the masterpiece of the world's art, in which Raphael reached that sublime height to which human genius was capable of aspiring.' Speaking of Michael Angelo's 'Crucifixions,' the Romans were wont to say, that to paint them he should have studied a living man nailed to a cross; whilst speaking of Raphael they expressed the belief that he drew inspiration from heaven for his pictures. Under the influence and patronage of the Roman Pontiffs, Raphael and Michael Angelo brought art to the highest degree of perfection.

After Raphael's death art began to decline. Seven years after Raphael's death, art received a fatal check in the tragic sack of Rome, when the German Protestant fanatics perpetrated, in the city of the Popes, horrors unparalleled in pagan or Christian history. Under the Constable of Bourbon they entered Rome in 1527, defiled and desecrated the churches, murdered ecclesiastics and lay people indiscriminately, and continued to burn and destroy all before them for several days. In the sack of the Vatican the faces of some of Raphael's frescoes were hacked and mutilated, whilst every portable work of the genius of past ages was borne away, sold and scattered through the world. England possesses about twenty of Raphael's pictures, and the visitor to the London National Gallery, South Kensington Museum, and the Dulwich Gallery can see some of the wonderful productions of this artist. After the horrors of 1527 Rome continued in a state of stupor for some time. Art had ceased, and the city made but slow progress towards recovery from its misfortunes, until the reign of Paul III. Earnest entreaty brought Michael Angelo back to Rome. The great artist viewed the wreck with tears in his eyes, and resolved to devote the remainder of his life to the work of restoration.

Amongst Raphael's followers there were many artists of ability, but they were scattered during the troubles at Rome. Contemporary with Raphael and Michael Angelo, in the full Italian Renaissance, were Andrea del Sarto, Correggio, Giorgione, Titian, and a host of other artists of

high ability. Andrea del Sarto, whose works are characterised by a wonderful delicacy of treatment, belonged to the Florentine School, and enjoyed the patronage of the Church in northern and central Italy. His finest masterpieces were painted for religious communities. In the Church of the Annunciation, at Florence, there is a magnificent series of pictures illustrating the life of St. Philip Benizzi. Amongst his altarpieces, several of which are now in the Pitti Palace, perhaps the greatest is the 'Dispute on the Trinity.' In this picture St. Augustine, who is the central figure, seems to be speaking under the influence of inspiration and with great earnestness of manner, whilst St. Dominic and St. Francis listen.

Correggio, another artist of this period, belonged to the Lombard School, and was one of the greatest masters of light and shade. Correggio's greatest work is the 'Assumption,' a decorative picture in the cupola of the Duomo of Parma, and amongst his easel pictures his best is the oft-repeated 'Marriage of St. Catherine.' A great number of Correggio's works, all of which are of a religious character, found their way into England during the Peninsular War. Some are in the London National Gallery. The 'Christ on the Mount of Olives,' the artist's greatest painting in this country, is in the possession of the Duke of Wellington.

Giorgione, a famous representative of the Venetian School and a follower of Leonardi da Vinci in style, produced some exquisite devotional pictures; but the best of his works have been lost or destroyed. His greatest existing work is the altarpiece in the Church of St. John Chrysostom, at Venice. The 'Raising of Lazarus,' a picture in the London Gallery, is a good example of the beauty and power of this master's art.

Titian was the greatest representative of the Venetian school of the Renaissance. Highly intellectual and cultured, Titian rose above his contemporaries in dignity of style and composition. His characters, though of wonderful execution and power, lack that beauty of the *spirituelle*

which enchants us in Raphael's productions. However, his greatest achievements were for the Catholic Church, and his noblest inspirations were drawn from the repository of the Faith. One of his most excellent works, the 'Assumption,' painted for the Church of Santa Maria Gloriosa de Frasi, his native village, is now in the Academia of Venice. According to Kugler, his 'Entombment of Christ,' in which emotion and sorrow are portrayed with a masterly hand, is amongst the noblest representations of the subject. His 'Presentation of the Blessed Virgin' is a curiosity, and displays no small eccentricity of genius, for the subject is depicted as if happening in medieval Venice. Amongst his altarpieces is the 'Martyrdom of St. Laurence,' in the Jesuit Church of Venice, and the 'Martyrdom of Blessed Peter.'

In the decline of the Renaissance two artists of repute appeared, Dominichino and Guido Reni. Dominichino, though not gifted in any extraordinary degree, was fortunate in the opportunity afforded him by the patronage of the Church. His best picture, the 'Communion of St. Jerome,' is in the Vatican. Critics say that his Four Evangelists, painted on the pendentives of the cupola of St. Andrea della Valle, are amongst the finest compositions of this period. His contemporary, Guido Reni, was an artist who had the endowments of the rarest gifts of genius, and who, considering the mannerisms which influenced all the artistic effort of the time, produced some pictures which prove great and striking originality of grace and charm. His 'Crucifixion of St. Peter,' which is in the Vatican, is a powerful picture, and is full of that emotion and feeling essential to the dignity of such a subject. The 'Crucifixion of the Saviour' is amongst the most beautiful of Guido Reni's creations. He painted a number of pictures at Rome, all of a religious character and all for ecclesiastical benefactors, but almost all of these are scattered throughout the world. In the cupola of the Cathedral at Ravenna, where the decoration of the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament was entrusted to

him, Guido Reni painted the magnificent fresco the 'Gathering of the Manna.'

The Italian schools continued to produce great hosts of artists who worked in the service of the Church, and all that deserve notice have had their meed of praise from the historians of Italian art. All could not be Raphaels, or Titians, or Angelos, but they still held their native art supreme by the charm of inspiration and originality, when compared with the art of other nations.

Studying the progress and culture of art from an historical aspect, and reviewing the material conditions under which the greatest of the masters laboured, we find, almost invariably, that it was the Catholic Church that lent that encouragement and recognition which genius looks upon as the essentials to work, and without which fame and success are but shadowless ghosts in the world of art. The great artists of the past, to whose memory all cultured people pay deserved tribute, reached the high pinnacle of their fame in working for the Church. It is she who has given to each one his laurels of merit and who has inscribed their names upon the tablets of time.

The galleries of Europe have been enriched with the spoil of the sanctuary and the monastery. Great masterpieces, which once formed portion of the patrimony of the Church, and upon which connoisseurs of our times have set such enormous material and æsthetic value, have passed from her keeping forever, still she holds in her possession some of the richest treasures of the world's art. Nor, in the day of adverse fortune, when she had to relinquish her claim to works that are now the gems of our public galleries, did she yield up her place as the supreme guardian spirit of the arts. New genius found ever ready encouragement and ever new inspiration in her service, and works bearing the highest marks of contemporary merit have filled the vacant niches, and blend in delightful harmony of colouring with the sombre tones of masterpieces of an earlier and a greater time.

E. A. FORAN, O.S.A.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

ABSOLUTION OF ACCOMPLICE

REV. DEAR SIR,—May I trouble you for your opinion on the following, *re* ‘casus complicitatis.’ Granted all are agreed on the matter which the reservation covers, the difficulty is in regard to the person involved :

- (a) Johannes—juvenis—peccat cum X ;
- (b) Johannes—Sub-diaconus—peccat cum Y ;
- (c) Johannes—Diaconus—peccat cum Z.

Quaestio nunc : Potestne Johannes—*nunc sacerdos*—valide absolvere X, Y, Z ?

One eminent theologian holds that the absolution is in all three cases valid. Another, equally eminent, that it is, in all three, invalid. *The Casuist* (an American four-volume publication) distinguishes—(a), Yes ; (b) and (c), No.

P.P.

Taking the absolution in the case to be absolution from the sin of complicity, we believe that the opinion held by the second theologian—according to which the absolution is invalid in all three cases—is the more probable. The main purpose of the law—to remove, as far as possible, all irreverence and occasion of sin from the administration of the sacrament—would seem to suggest it. The words of the decree, moreover, make no distinction : and, according to the old maxim, ‘when the law makes no distinction, neither should we.’

Omnibus et singulis sacerdotibus [it states] . . . interdicimus et prohibemus, ne aliquis eorum extra casum necessitatis . . . confessionem sacramentalem *personae complicitis* in peccato turpi atque inhonesto contra sextum Decalogi praeceptum commissio excipere audeat, sublata propterea illi ipso jure *quacumque* jurisdictione ad *qualemcumque* personam ab hujusmodi culpa absolvendam, adeo quidem, ut absolutio, si quam impetierit, nulla atque irrita omnino sit.

And an answer, given by the Penitentiary, on January 22, 1879, bears out the view, ‘Confessarium non posse absolvere complicem, cum quo ante sacerdotium in puerili aetate turpiter egit, nisi moraliter certus sit ipsum iam ab alio sacerdote directe et valide a peccato complicitatis absolutum fuisse.’ If that be

true in the circumstances stated, it is true *a fortiori* in the second and third cases mentioned by our correspondent: the want of reverence for the sacrament would be greater, and the occasion of sin more proximate. Nor need the exception stated in the last clause cause any difficulty: it is quite probable that, in all cases, the confessor has jurisdiction in regard to the other sins of his penitent, and that even a new absolution of the reserved sin, though generally gravely unlawful, is not invalid¹: in other words, the concluding clause of the decision gives no grounds for drawing a distinction between the first of 'P.P.'s' cases and the others.

Prominent authorities, however, take a different view. They draw attention to the fact that, in the decree, special emphasis is laid on 'sacrilege'²—that, therefore, the law has no binding force when the sin was committed before the reception of sacred Orders. Sacrilegious complicity, not complicity simply, they think, is the crime aimed at: the latter is a much less serious offence and should not be visited with the same penalty. The Pope's intention, they say, was 'partly to preserve the holy tribunal of Penance from desecration, and partly to protect the priest and souls confided to his care against temptation'³: 'magnopere cupientes a sacerdotalis iudicii et sacri tribunalis sanctitate omnem turpitudinis occasionem et sacramentorum contemptum et Ecclesiae injuriam longe submovere et tam exitiosa hujusmodi mala prorsus eliminare, et, quantum in Domino possumus, animarum periculis occurrere.' Contempt for the sacraments, and the occasion of sin, would, they contend, be remote, when the sin had been committed a very long time before, when there was no sacrilege, and when sincere penance had been done in the meantime; the aim and purpose of the law would cease, and the law itself cease, therefore, also.

The reasoning would establish a difference between the first case and the other two. But, even in regard to the first, it does not, in view of what has been already stated, establish the proposition. Whatever inferences may be drawn from isolated words and statements, the fact remains that a legislator may reasonably think a wide prohibition the only effective means of preventing a restricted abuse, and that no modification, such as these words and statements supply, is found in the legislative portion of the decree already quoted. And the vast majority of theologians have understood the decree in the wider sense.⁴

¹ Cf. D'Annibale, iii. n. 324, note; Génicot, ii. 352, etc.

² 'Sacrilegi quidam qui complicem in peccato turpi absolvere audeant.'

³ Schmid (in *The Casuist*, iii. pp. 257-60); Ballerini, n. 649, etc.

⁴ Scavini, *Th. Mor.*, iii. 485; Gury, *Casus*, p. 11; Pruner, *Handbook*, p. 471; Lehmkuhl, *Th. Mor.*, ii. 690; Génicot, *Th. Mor.*, ii. 352; Slater, *Manual*, ii. 214, *Cases*, ii. 199, etc.

The common view is the more probable. But, as is well known, even a less probable opinion is often safe in practice. And, in deference to the theologians who hold the second view, as well as to the arguments with which they support it, we are inclined to think that a confessor who adopted it in practice would neither give an invalid absolution nor incur the excommunication.¹ For the reasons given he would be much safer in the first case than in the second and third. And in all cases he would be depending, not on what is much more likely the truth, but on an interpretation of law based on the principles of Probabilism.

ADMINISTRATION OF HOLY COMMUNION TO THE SICK

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be obliged if you would favour me with your opinion in the following case. It is asked should the Viaticum always be given at once in cases of *periculum mortis*, whether the danger be remote or proximate.

Thus: Should a person have a dangerous illness which might terminate fatally, but in which the doctor considers there is no immediate danger—supposing the sick person has not been laid up for a month, and is unable to receive fasting—must the priest, if he gives him Holy Communion, administer it *per modum Viatici*, or can he give it in the ordinary way until the danger becomes proximate? In other words, must the sick man in this case go without Communion unless he receive it *in forma Viatici*?

An answer in the next number of the I. E. RECORD would be much appreciated.

SACERDOS.

The law formulated by the Council of Constance² regarding the administration of the Viaticum to persons dangerously ill holds to the present day. The fast should be observed if it implies no inconvenience to the patient, priest, or attendants.³ But any slight inconvenience of a reasonable kind on the part of any of those mentioned is sufficient to excuse from the obligation. The Viaticum may then be administered to a non-fasting patient, not once or twice merely, but as often as he desires, while the danger lasts. The privilege is restricted, though, to cases in which there is good reason for saying that the danger, though not necessarily immediate or imminent, is real and serious.⁴

For less serious cases no provision was made till the law of 1906 appeared. We have already described its provisions and the class

¹ Génicot, loc. cit., says: 'Non absonum videtur in casu, utique rarissimo, recurrere ad epikeiam. Insuper plerumque moraliter certum erit illud peccatum iam ab alio confessore absolutum esse.'

² Sess. 13.

³ Suarez, a. 68, s. 5, n. 2; St. Alph., vi. n. 284; etc.

⁴ Benedict XIV, *De Syn. Dioc.*, l. vii. c. 12, n. 5; St. Alph., vi. 285, etc.

of persons to which it applies.¹ The class is more extensive, the provisions less.

Now, the two sets of cases are quite distinct, and there is no authority for extending to one the regulations governing the other. The law of 1906 cannot be applied when the conditions it requires (month's sickness, etc.) have not been fulfilled. If in such circumstances the patient is gravely, but not dangerously, ill, he has to conform to the general law about fasting; if he is dangerously ill he may receive without fasting, as often as he wishes—but *per modum Viatici*. The person mentioned by 'Sacerdos' belongs apparently to the second category.

CESSATION OF DISPENSATION. TWO HONORARIA ON THE SAME DAY

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you please give your opinion on the following questions in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD :—

I. The Bishop of the diocese in which I live gave a dispensation at the beginning of Lent, from the law of abstinence, even on Fridays. The said dispensation is to continue until further notice is received. The cause on account of which the dispensation is given is twofold, viz., the difficulty in procuring fish and the high price at which fish is sold since the outbreak of the present war. Now, neither of these causes exist in this part of the country: on the contrary, fish can be bought at a lower price than flesh meat. I hold that, since there is no excusing cause or, if there has been, it has now ceased—the dispensation has also ceased, or is invalid or *ultra vires episcopi* to grant. But my particular difficulty is this: my parish priest and myself live together and dine together, and he has to do with the regulating of meals, etc., so that when I go to the dining-room on Fridays I find meat at all meals, the same as any other day. The parish priest seems to feel no difficulty, and tells me that the act of obedience to the will of the Bishop in using the dispensation is more meritorious than fasting and abstaining under the circumstances. What am I to do?

II. There is a rule in this diocese which forbids a priest to receive two stipends on the same day for the two Masses which he says. The purpose of the law is to prevent an unscrupulous priest from trading in 'holy things.' But there is no necessity for the law if the priest is forbidden to say two Masses unless in case of necessity. Therefore, when it is necessary for a priest to duplicate does it not seem that he may lawfully accept an offering for each Mass? I take the word 'necessary' in the strict sense of the term.

P. G.

1. Authorities are agreed that, when a dispensation is given absolutely it will continue, even when the motive cause for which it was given has entirely ceased. The trouble is to decide when a dispensation *is* given absolutely. The rule generally given is that the dispensation is absolute when the obligation it removes is one and indivisible—the obligation, for example, on two relatives not

¹ I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. iii, pp. 416 sqq.

to get married; and that the opposite is the case when the obligation is divisible—in the case, for instance, of saying the divine Office or fasting during Lent.¹ Though both sections of the principle are questioned, it furnishes a good rule in practice. But all admit that it loses its force when there are other indications to hand; and that, among the latter, the intention (either expressed or prudently presumed) of the dispensing superior holds a foremost place.

It must also be noted that the dispensation certainly continues until the cause has completely ceased. Partial recovery of an invalid will not deprive him of a dispensation secured when he was seriously ill, nor a slight relaxation affect a dispensation granted on account of hard work.

Now, it is possible that in the present case there were other reasons besides those mentioned by our correspondent: the necessity for greater physical effort in strenuous times may be one, and others can be easily imagined. Even though the two mentioned by 'P. G.' had come to an end, the dispensation might, therefore, still hold. And indeed, it may be questioned whether even these have come to an end: the Bishop who gave the dispensation is the best judge, and 'P. G.' may safely leave the matter in his hands. It is quite unnecessary, moreover, that the cause should hold for each individual in a community, or for each small locality in a diocese. And, finally, in spite of the rule given above, it is just possible that the dispensation was given absolutely: if the causes mentioned were the only ones, and if 'P. G.'s' statement applies to the whole diocese, the fact that the Bishop has not withdrawn the dispensation would seem to point in that direction.

We think, therefore, that 'P. G.' need have no scruple. His act is not exactly one of obedience: but is a legitimate use of a favour granted.

2. The general law forbids the saying of two Masses by the same priest on the same day, except in case of necessity: the law against receiving a *honorarium* for the second Mass—equally general—is sometimes relaxed on the plea of 'necessity' also. But the word has different meanings in the two contexts: otherwise the second law would seldom find an application. In the former case the word covers the spiritual needs of the parishioners: in the second the temporal wants of the priest or of an institution. Either may exist without the other. And hence in a case of 'necessity' of the first kind two Masses may sometimes be said, but, if 'necessity' of the second kind does not exist, two *honoraria* may not be accepted.

¹ Cf. Suarez, *De leg.*, l. vi. c. 20, n. 18; Bargilliat, *Jus Can.*, i. n. 99, etc.

A QUESTION OF DELEGATION. THE ACT OF CONTRITION FORMULA

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly answer the following questions in the I. E. RECORD :—

I. A parish priest says to his curates: 'I give both of you all faculties to assist at every marriage that may turn up in the parish.' May the curates assist at every marriage without getting delegation from the parish priest, even if they could easily ask him for it?

II. I meet many aged penitents who make the Act of Contrition as follows: 'O my God! I am heartily sorry for having offended You, because You are the chief good and worthy of all my love, and I firmly resolve with the help of Your holy grace to amend my life.' Such expression of contrition seems to me insufficient, first, because it does not contain an expression of the penitent's *detestation* of sin, and, secondly, because the words 'to amend my life' are very vague and do not express the purpose of avoiding all mortal sin.

I would be glad to learn that the form quoted above is sufficient, as it would save me a great deal of trouble in getting so many old people to repeat the form of the Act of Contrition as given in the 'Maynooth' Catechism.

CONFESSARIUS.

I. The curates have got delegation; there is no need to ask for it again.

II. As regards contrition, even according to the strictest views, nothing more is required than that real contrition—or attrition—be externated somehow. No special form of words, in fact no word at all, is essential. Friends of ours who have heard confessions in foreign countries have assured us that in many places no special formula whatever is employed. From that point of view, therefore, the formula given by 'Confessarius' is more than sufficient. But, perhaps, his real difficulty is whether the state of mind expressed by such a formula is a sufficient disposition. Clearly it is not. The resolution to 'amend one's life' is technically compatible with the intention of committing any number of mortal sins. And such an intention makes the sacrament unfruitful.

In practice, however, the formula would not express the penitents' full intention. Any ordinary Catholic using it would mean to express, and would really entertain, the sorrow that is essential. It is useful, though, in this matter to have ideas fully expressed and to employ formulæ that uphold a proper standard. We need hardly say, therefore, that the insertion of 'never more to offend You (seriously),' or some such phrase before the final clause, would be a decided improvement.

The technical difference between 'sorrow' and 'detestation' is that a person may 'detest' almost anything, whereas he can be 'sorry' only for his own actions and their results. A person who has never sinned, or is incapable of sinning, may detest sin, but

cannot be sorry for it. In case of penitents, however, there is no need to distinguish between the two. Detestation is included in sorrow and requires no separate expression.

MARRIAGES BETWEEN PERSONS OF DIFFERENT DENOMINATIONS IN IRELAND

In connexion with a reply published in our last issue (page 295), Mr. Doheny, Solicitor, Kilkenny, has kindly sent us a further communication. The complicated cases arising from the present crisis give it a special interest.

KILKENNY, *March 11, 1915.*

REV. DEAR SIR,—A clergyman friend has brought to my notice a reply in your issue of the present month to a query as to legal formalities for marriages between Christians of different denominations, whereby you refer the inquirer to two letters of mine in your issues of March and May, 1912.

There is one point in the latter letter which I was partly minded to press further when writing it, and which, I have thought since, should be pressed further. I consider that in order to make the procedure (issue of licence by Bishop's appointee, after notice served on clergymen of places of worship the respective parties are in the habit of attending—afforded by the Act of 1871) *indisputably* valid, both parties should not merely be domiciled (one in Ireland and the other in some part of the United Kingdom), but that both should be domiciled in Ireland. If either of the parties is domiciled in Britain, the procedure by notice to and certificate from the civil registrar in whose district the church where the wedding is intended to be celebrated is situate, under the Acts of 1844, 1863, (chap. 27), and 1870, is safer. In this connexion it must be remembered that 'domicile' will be determined by British civil law, not Church law. It seems rather clear, though I must not be taken as warranting it, that a soldier from Britain, garrisoned here in the ordinary way in peace time, is domiciled here, but as regards recruits sent over here from Britain for training, because of barrack space available or so on, or other exceptional movements during the present war, it would, I think, be wise, for safety sake, neither to assume such sojourn here to constitute an Irish domicile, nor treat the licence after notice to the respective clergymen as applicable. In other words, in any case of marriage between an Irish Catholic girl and one of Kitchener's army, it seems safer to follow the procedure involving the registrar of the district of intended place of celebration.

It will be understood that this and former letters deal wholly with Irish statutes, and do not touch on the question of marriages celebrated in Great Britain at all.

I am, Rev. Dear Sir,

Very faithfully yours,

FRANCIS W. DOHENY, *Solicitor.*

NOTE.—Several queries have to be held over till our next issue.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

DISMEMBERMENT OF PARISHES AND MISSIONS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should esteem it a favour if you would give your valuable opinion on the following case.

The Ordinary of an English diocese takes away a portion of the district attached to St. A's Church, and gives it to St. B's Church, whereby St. A's Church loses £80 *per annum* of its income—derived from bench rents, door contributions, offertories, collections, etc., which, by the Council of Westminster, are to be accounted as ecclesiastical property. After three months' experience the total income of St. A's Church is found to be less than the total expenses for that period. Hence bankruptcy. The reason of the Bishop in so acting was not to establish a new mission, nor for the convenience of the people, but to give more support to a neighbouring church. It is asked :—

1. Is the act of the Bishop valid without consulting the Holy See ?
2. What steps should be taken for the recovery of compensation ?
3. In case the Bishop refuses to do anything, what is the next procedure ?

RECTOR.

The act by which a portion of its territory and people is taken away from one parish and added to another already existing one is technically known in Canon Law as dismemberment. The transference of portion of the temporal goods of one benefice to another is, however, also known by the same name. For this latter kind of dismemberment there is a division of opinion as to whether the consent of the Holy See is required.

Some prominent canonists, such as Wernz,¹ maintain that it is, as this species of dismemberment is nothing other than the alienation of Church property, for which Papal permission is always required, even when it takes place between two ecclesiastical institutions. The weight of opinion, however, seems to be on the other side. But we need not labour the question further, as we are not directly interested in it at present.

There is no doubt that the other form of dismemberment, of which the case submitted to us affords an example, may be performed by a Bishop, without any reference to the Holy See. Episcopal power in the matter is, however, limited by certain conditions when there is question of canonical parishes in the strict sense of the term. There is no necessity, though, to enter into a discussion of them, as they do not apply to quasi-parishes or missions with which alone our correspondent is evidently concerned. The official teaching regarding the dismemberment of missions is contained in

¹ *Jus. Decret.*, tom. ii. n. 269.

the Constitution *Romanos Pontifices* issued by Leo XIII in 1881. It will be remembered that this decree was primarily published to settle certain controversies between the Bishops of England and Scotland and the Regulars living in these countries. One of the points at issue between them regarded this very question of the dismemberment and division of missions. The Regulars insisted that all the formalities prescribed by Canon Law for the division of parishes should be observed also when missions were being divided ; whereas the Bishops maintained that it was sufficient to follow the prescriptions of the first Synod of Westminster on the matter.¹ The controversy was decided in favour of the Bishops by the Constitution, from which we cannot do better than quote a few passages, which set forth very clearly the existing discipline on this matter :—

Itaque ad divisionem missionis simplicis ea juris solemnia transferenda non sunt quae super dismembratione paroeciarum fuerunt constitutae ; eo vel magis quod propter missionum indolem et peculiares circumstantias, numero plures ac leviores causae possint occurrere, quae istarum divisionem suadeant, quam quae jure definitae sint ut fiat paroeciarum divisio. Neve quis urgeat similitudinem quam utraeque inter se habent, cum enim obligatio servandi solemnia juris libertatem agendi coerceat, ad similes causas non est pertrahenda. . . . Quae cum ita sint ad propositam consultationem respondemus : licere episcopis missiones dividere servata forma S. C. Tridentini quoad missiones quae sunt vere propriae dictae paroeciae ; {quoad reliquas vero, ad formam Synodi I Provincialis Westmonasteriensis.

Quo melius autem missioni quae dividenda sit ejusque ministris prospiciatur, volumus ac praecipimus ut sententia quoque rectoris exquiratur, quod jam accepimus laudabiliter esse in more positum.

The method of division prescribed by the First Synod of Westminster to which reference is made in the Constitution is contained in the following statute : ‘ Non obstante rectoris missionarii deputatione, licebit Episcopo de consilio Capituli, intra limites missionis cui praeponitur, novas ecclesias condere ac portionem districtus iis attribuire, si necessitas aut utilitas populi fidelis id requirat.’²

It is true that this statute and the Constitution *Romanos Pontifices* itself deal directly only with the division of missions, not with their dismemberment in the strict sense of the term in which we have defined it, but, as the latter is only a species of the former, we are justified in transferring to it the conditions prescribed for division, just as is done in the case of strict canonical parishes.

¹ ‘ Jamvero de his missionibus disceptatum fuit, an et quomodo fieri possit ab episcopis earum divisio, seu ut dici solet, dismembratio. Nam qui Regularium jura tuebantur, negabant hanc divisionem fieri posse nisi legitimis de causis, adhibitisque juris solemnibus quae praescripta sunt ab Alexandro III et a Concilio Tridentino. Alia vero erat Episcoporum opinatio.’—Constit. *Romanos Pontifices*.

² Decretum XIII, n. 5.

From the legislation, then, which we have quoted we may deduce that a Bishop, in dismembering a mission, must observe the following conditions :—

1. He must see that there exists a just cause for the dismemberment, which, according to the statutes of Westminster, should have reference to the necessity or utility of the people. We should consider the necessity of providing for the upkeep of the second mission, to which the portion of territory has been added on, a quite sufficient reason, especially as, according to the *Romanos Pontifices*, the cause, on account of which division may take place, is to be widely interpreted : ‘propter missionum indolem et peculiaris circumstantias, numero plures ac leviores causae possint occurrere, quae istarum divisionem suadeant.’ Of course we presuppose that the revenues of the first mission are superfluous, otherwise dismemberment, with this sole object, would be unreasonable.

2. He should consult the Chapter of the diocese, but it is by no means necessary to obtain their consent.

3. He should also consult the rectors whose interests are affected by dismemberment ; but again, their consent is quite unnecessary.

We are now in a position to answer directly our correspondent’s queries.

1. The validity of the Bishop’s act is altogether independent of the consent of the Holy See.

2. According to the facts stated ‘Rector’ certainly has a grievance in this matter, and in the circumstances we should advise him, in the first place, to lay the whole case before the Bishop, and ask him for some redress.

3. Should this fail, then the only course open to him, if he wishes to proceed further, is to have recourse to the Holy See. Such recourse would not suspend the operation of the episcopal decree, while the case was being decided at Rome ; it would only have the *effectus devolutivus*, as it is called.

The Congregation competent to deal with a question of this kind is the Consistorial.

‘LETTING OF PEWS AND GRAVES

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be obliged if your Canon Law correspondent would be kind enough to state, in an early number of the I. E. RECORD, whether the legislation forbidding the alienation of Church property, which was so lucidly explained in the December number,¹ debars a parish priest from letting a pew in his church, or a grave in the church grounds without the authorisation of the Pope or the Bishop.

D. B.

1. There is no doubt that a parish priest may let pews in his

church, so far as their temporary revocable use is concerned, without any reference to the Holy See, and even without the express consent of the Bishop, unless there is special legislation or custom to the contrary.¹ On the other hand, canonists are quite agreed that the concession of a perpetual right to pews and seats in churches cannot be granted without the permission of the Holy See, and, though writers are not explicit on this point, we should say the same thing holds for the concession of such a right for any period longer than three years.²

The reason upon which canonists base their conclusion is that a grant of this nature involves the imposition on the church of a *jus servitutis* in perpetuity, or for a long period, and this, in law, is equiparated to alienation, so far as the restrictions governing alienation are concerned. Pignatelli, in the following sentence, puts very clearly the general teaching on this point: 'Certum enim in jure est quod nulla servitus perpetua et irrevocabilis potest imponi ecclesiae absque Summi Pontificis consensu; atque adeo nec minus haec tenendi in ea sedile imponi potest, ita ut sit perpetua, quae de sua natura est revocabilis ac proinde ad Rectoris libitum potest revocari.'³ Other canonists, such as Ferraris⁴ and Gennari⁵ are quite as explicit. Several decisions, too, of the Roman Congregations are referred to by these writers which place the matter beyond all doubt.⁶

2. The letting of graves seems to be in the same position as the

¹ 'Che nelle chiese possano tenersi banchi da privati è fuori dubbio, purché intervenga il consenso espresso o tacito del rettore della chiesa medesima o del Vescovo della diocesi.'—Gennari, *Consultazione Canoniche*, tom. ii. p. 489 et seq.

'Ex tolerantia tamen vel licentia episcopi, seu Rectoris Ecclesiae possunt laici acquirere jus retinendi sedilia, seu sedendi in Ecclesia, non quoad dominium vel proprietatem sed solum quoad usum revocabilem ad libitum Rectoris et Episcopi.'—Ferraris, *Bibliotheca*, v. Ecclesia, art. v. n. 8.

Monacelli, tom. i. tit. 1, formul. 8, n. 4, etc.

² Gennari, l.c.; Ferraris, l.c.

³ Tom. ix., consult. 147.

⁴ l.c.

⁵ 'Dunque il detto consenso equivale ad una tolleranza, onde i laici hanno il diritto di ritenere nelle chiese i loro banchi; però questo diritto non è mica di dominio o di proprietà, ma del solo uso, revocabile sempre a piacimento del Rettore o del Vescovo. E la ragione è manifesta Imperocchè se con quella permissione si acquistasse il diritto di dominio o di proprietà, imporrebbsi con ciò una vera servitù alla chiesa; e però quel permesso revestirebbe la natura di alienazione di beni immobilè, cui vanno equiparate le servitù, il che i canonisti condannano sotto censura, ed annullano *ipso facto* quando non siasene ottenuta la venia dalla S. Sede.'—Loc. cit.

⁶ 'Non si dee permettere quella proprietà dei luoghi che alcuni si persuadono di avere nelle chiese, quasi che fossero loro ereditarii, come sono le case e le possessioni, che si comprano.'—S.C. EE. et RR., 7 April, 1583, in *Januen*.

S.C.C. 5 Septemb., 1665, in causa Anagnina, etc.

letting of pews, so far as imposing burdens on ecclesiastical property is concerned, and hence one naturally expects to find them both subject to some restrictions. Yet it is universally admitted that the perpetual and exclusive rights of burial in a particular portion of a cemetery may be conceded without the consent of the Holy See. Some canonists maintain that this difference is due to the express concession of the law of the Decretals. Cardinal Genari, for example, after showing how the right of patronage, which under certain aspects would seem to come under the prohibitions regarding alienation, may, in virtue of special legislation, be granted without any reference to Rome, says that the same thing is also true of the right of burial which is permitted by the sacred canons, and *in specie* by the chapter *Ad Apostolicam*.¹ It is very doubtful, however, whether the chapter thus appealed to by the learned canonist proves his contention.

The majority of writers prefer to admit that the letting of graves would be primarily subject to the prohibitions of the Constitution *Ambitiosa*, and explain the existing discipline as the result of the restrictive interpretation of this decree by commentators, and especially by the Roman Curia.² Petra quotes a decision of the Congregation of the Council, which expressly declares that a concession of a right of this kind was valid without the consent of the Holy See.³ Whatever may be the true explanation there can be no doubt as to the fact itself that reference to the Holy See in this matter is quite unnecessary.

Whether the parish priest would require the consent of the Bishop depends, again, upon local custom and legislation. As far as we are aware Bishops, in this country, do not interfere in this matter.

A BISHOP'S POWER TO DISPENSE OUTSIDE HIS TERRITORY

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you be good enough to explain, through the medium of the I. E. RECORD, in how far a Bishop may use his power of dispensing outside his own diocese?

X. Y.

For the sake of clearness we must distinguish between a Bishop's ordinary power of dispensing and the power which he has in virtue of faculties delegated to him by the Holy See.

There can be no doubt that a Bishop can use his ordinary power of dispensing, of course, in favour only of his own subjects,

¹ 'Lo stesso vuolsi dire del diritto alle sepolture ammesso altresì dai sacri canoni, specie dal *cap. Apostolicam de Sim.*'—Loc. cit.

² Vide Many, *De Locis Sacris*, p. 255; Petra, t. v. p. 217 et seq.; Giraldis, *Expositio*, sect. DCCLV. p. 563.

³ S.C.C., 6 Sept. 1659, in causa Meletensi.

not only when he himself, or his subject, but also when both are outside his diocese. The power to dispense is only a form of voluntary jurisdiction, and it is a general principle of canonists that the exercise of such jurisdiction is not restricted to any particular territory.¹

Per se the same thing is true of the power to dispense in virtue of faculties obtained from the Holy See, not only for the reason given in connexion with ordinary jurisdiction, but also because, apart from special restrictions, a delegate may utilise his power everywhere throughout the territory of the superior delegating; and in this matter a Bishop is merely acting as the delegate of the Pope.

As is evident, however, a superior, when delegating, may impose restrictions in regard to the place in which the faculties delegated are to be exercised; and, of course, when such restrictions are placed, the delegate is bound to conform himself to them. Manifestly it is impossible for us to enter upon a discussion of various restrictions of this nature which, in particular cases, the Holy See may deem it right to impose; there are, however, a couple of general ones the force of which it is necessary to determine for an adequate solution of this question.

The first of these restrictions, which we shall touch upon, is that which is attached to the faculties of some of the *Formulae*, and amongst others to the faculties of the *Formula VI*, formerly granted by the Propaganda to the Bishops of this country.²

The form in which the restriction is expressed is the following: 'Nec illis uti potest extra fines suae dioecesis.' From these words it is not clear whether it is the Bishop himself, or his subject, who should be in the diocese, or whether even the presence of both is necessary, when any particular faculty is being exercised, and, consequently, for some time considerable uncertainty on the point prevailed. The Congregation of the Holy Office, however, authoritatively declared, in 1865, and again in 1877, that the words required the presence in the diocese of the subject only, not of the Bishop.³

The Irish Bishops obtained some relaxation of this general prohibition. By special concession of the Holy See they may

¹ Vide Smith, *Elements of Eccles. Law*, vol. iii. n. 1722; Bargilliat, *Prael. Juris Canonici*, vol. i. n. 180; D'Annibale, *Sum. Th. Mor.*, vol. i. n. 75; Ojetti, *Synopsis Rerum Moralium*, vol. ii. p. 2431, etc.

² Vide *Appendix to Maynooth Statutes*, p. 148.

³ S.C.S. Officii, 2 Maii, 1877. Quomodo intelligenda verba Formulae VI. 'Nec illis (facultatibus in Formula contentis) ullo modo uti possit (episcopus) extra fines suae dioecesis?' R. Verba relatae Formulae ita esse intelligenda, ut Episcopus uti possit facultatibus erga suos subditos qui actu quo dispensandi sunt in propria dioecesi commorantur, quamvis ipse Episcopus extra suam dioecesim degat.' Coll. de Prop. Fide, n. 158.

exercise their powers of dispensing from a defect of the canonical age for priesthood and from the observance of the canonical times and intervals prescribed for the conferring of Orders in favour of their students resident in Maynooth and the Irish College, Paris. Putzer relates, too, that the American Bishops, to whose faculties a similar clause was attached, were permitted to grant matrimonial dispensations to their subjects resident in other dioceses, provided they had not acquired there a domicile or quasi-domicile.¹

The other general restriction to which we should like to call attention is that attached to the faculties granted to Bishops by the chapter *Liceat* of the Council of Trent. These have reference to the power of absolving from occult Papal cases and of dispensing from suspensions and irregularities arising from an occult crime, and the limitation imposed is that they can be utilised only by the Bishop in his own diocese. The portion of the chapter which has reference to the point with which we are concerned is as follows: 'Liceat episcopis . . . dispensare . . . et . . . in dioecesi sua . . . absolvere.' Here, again, the words leave it doubtful whose presence is required in the diocese at the time the dispensation or absolution is given.

From the grammatical structure it would seem more likely that it is the Bishop himself who should be in the diocese, whereas from analogy with the similar clause attached to the *Formulae* one would be inclined to conclude that it is the presence of the subject that is required. As no authoritative interpretation has ever been given the matter really remains doubtful, and hence, in practice, a Bishop may utilise this power so long as either himself or his subject remains in the diocese.²

J. KINANE.

¹ Verum circa dispensationes matrimoniales S.C.S. Officii . . . concessit 'ut Ordinarius etiam subditis extra dioecesim morantibus dispensationem indulgere possit, dummodo in aliena dioecesi saltem quasi-domicilium ad normam juris non contraxerint.'—*Commentarium in Facultates*, Ap. n. 52.

² 'Illa autem verba, *in dioecesi sua*, utrum pertineant ad absolventem an ad absolvendum, non satis convenit; ideo sat erit alterutrum in ea versari.'—D'Annibale, *Sum. Th. Mor.*, vol. i. n. 346.

Lega, *De Judiciis Eccl.*, vol. iii. p. 181, etc.

LITURGY

NO OBLIGATION TO SAY A PRAYER FOR THE DEAD IN A Ferial MASS, EVEN TO GAIN THE INDULGENCE OF THE PRIVILEGED ALTAR. THE 'ORATIO IMPERATA' IN A Ferial MASS WHEN A PRAYER FOR THE DEAD HAS BEEN INSERTED. OMISSION OF THE SECOND OF TWO 'ORATIONES IMPERATAE.' THE VERSICLES AND RESPONSES AFTER THE 'TE DEUM' SUNG DURING EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly answer the following queries in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD :—

1. Is there an *obligation* to say the prayer for the dead in a ferial Mass when the Mass is offered for the repose of the soul of a deceased person (a) at a privileged altar, or (b) at an altar which is not privileged ?

2. If there be such an obligation will not this prayer count as a prayer prescribed by the rubrics, and will not an *Oratio imperata* be excluded in such a Mass, except the prayer is ordered *pro re gravissima* ?

3. If there be two *Orationes imperatae*, would it be lawful to omit one of them when three prayers are prescribed by the rubrics, on the ground that the rubrics do not contemplate more than four prescribed prayers ?

4. When the *Te Deum* is sung at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament I never chant the versicles and responses after it, but simply say the prayer *Pro gratiarum actione* under one conclusion with the prayer *Deus qui nobis*. Am I correct ? Some tell me there has been a decision against me in recent years, but I have not been able to find it.

A SUBSCRIBER.

1. We do not think that anyone ever held that there is an *obligation* to insert a prayer for the dead in a ferial Mass when there is no question of gaining the indulgence of the privileged altar. The wording of the rubric really leaves no room for doubt. '*Licebit . . . in hujusmodi missis de feria orationem addi pro defunctis pro quibus Sacrificium applicatur.*' That part of the rubric, however, which refers to the conditions necessary in order to gain the indulgence of the privileged altar was by no means so clear, and a considerable diversity of opinion arose regarding it. In order to settle all disputes the Congregation of Rites declared, on June 12, 1912, that if a priest wishes to apply the indulgence mentioned he *must* (a) select the ferial Mass when a choice is allowed by the new rubrics, and (b) insert a suitable prayer for the person deceased.

Ut rite legitimeque applicari possit pro defunctis indulgentia altaris privilegiati, oportet ut, diebus in quibus a novis rubricis permittitur, missa de feria omnino celebretur, addita ut supra oratione pro defunctis pro quibus missa ipsa celebratur.

This regulation, however, did not remain long in force. For, on February 20, 1913, the Congregation issued a decree stating that in future it is not necessary, in order to gain the indulgence of the privileged altar, to say a requiem, ferial, or vigil Mass, and that if a ferial (or vigil) Mass is selected, the prayer for the dead may be inserted, but not necessarily.

Ad altaris privilegiati, quod vocant, indulgentiam lucranda, non amplius in posterum sub poena nullitatis requiri missam de requie aut de feria vel vigilia cum oratione defuncti propria celebrari; id tamen laudabiliter fieri, cum licet ac decet, pietatis gratia erga defunctum.

2. According to the present regulations, therefore, there is no *obligation* to insert a prayer for a deceased person in order to gain the indulgence. Hence we believe that if such a prayer is inserted the *Oratio imperata* must be added, even though four prayers have already been said. For it seems quite clear that, in this connexion, the *Oratio imperata* is to be omitted only when four prayers are already of *obligation* by the rubrics—‘quandocumque in missa dicendae sint plus quam tres orationes a Rubrica eo die *praescriptae*.’ One is free to insert a prayer for the dead in a ferial Mass just in the same way as one is free to add votive prayers; and surely no one would hold that the *Oratio imperata* may be omitted simply because the priest wishes to add votive prayers.

All this seems so evident that we read with some amazement an article in the *Ephemerides Liturgicae*,¹ in which the author endeavours to show that the *Oratio imperata* should be omitted in a ferial Mass when a prayer for the dead has been inserted. His arguments may be of some interest to our readers, though we believe them to be utterly unconvincing.

In the first place, he says that the word *praescriptae* in the rubric (‘plus quam tres orationes,’ etc.) is not to be taken in the strict sense, but should be extended so as to mean ‘*prescribed or permitted*.’ This interpretation he founds on the supposed fact that in an answer of the Congregation of Rites, dated June 21, 1912, the word in question has this extended meaning. The Congregation answered affirmatively the question: ‘An collectae omit-tendae sunt quando in missis privatis, post tres orationes eo die praescriptas, addita est oratio SS. Sacramenti publice expositi vel pro Papa aut Episcopo in respectivis anniversariis?’

Now, he argues, the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament is not of obligation in *all* Masses when Exposition is going on in the church. And yet the Congregation declares that if the prayer is said—no distinction being made as to whether it is obligatory or not—the *Oratio imperata* is to be omitted. It is perfectly true, of course,

¹ August, 1914, pp. 489-491.

that the *Oratio SS. Sacramenti* is not of obligation in all Masses when the Blessed Sacrament is exposed. But the Congregation evidently refers to the cases in which it is obligatory, just as the prayer on the anniversary of the Pope or Bishop is obligatory. Any other interpretation is only ingenious trifling. It may be observed that in defining the place of the *Oratio pro defunctis* in a ferial Mass the Congregation states that the prayer is to be placed in the second last place 'inter orationes ea die a rubricis *praescriptas vel permissas*.' From this we may conclude that when *praescriptae* alone is used in the new rubric the word is to be taken in its strict sense. Moreover, as already stated, if the *Oratio imperata* may be omitted when certain prayers are *permitted* by the rubric a priest would be, in practice, free to omit it, in ferial and simple festive Masses, by the substitution of votive prayers of his own choice. For there is really no ground for distinction in this respect between what are known as votive prayers in the strict sense and the prayer which, according to the new rubrics, may now be inserted in a ferial Mass. The only difference is the place which they occupy.

His second argument is not more satisfactory. It is built on the following section of the decree of June 12, 1912: 'Hujusmodi oratio pro defunctis non excludit in casu orationes de tempore, nisi occurrat commemoratio duplicis' (Par. II).

Now, he argues, this decree of June 12 was expressly issued 'ad praecavendas dubitationes quae super recta interpretatione tituli x. n. 2 et 5 novarum rubricarum oriri possunt.' The object of the second paragraph (just quoted) is to show what prayers are *not* excluded by the addition of the prayer for the dead. The *orationes de tempore* are the only ones mentioned. If the *Oratio imperata* were not excluded it would have been mentioned also. Hence we are to conclude, since the decree is intended to remove all our difficulties, that when the prayer for the dead is added to the three ordinary prayers of a ferial Mass, the *Oratio imperata* is to be omitted.

Again, this reasoning is far more ingenious than convincing. To anyone but a special pleader it must seem evident that the object of the second paragraph on which so much stress is laid is not at all what the writer alleges. A doubt might exist as to whether the prayer for the dead could take the place of one of the *Orationes de tempore* in a ferial Mass. The scope of the second paragraph is really to settle this doubt, and it is stated that none of the *Orationes de tempore* is to be omitted in the ferial Mass because of the insertion of a prayer for the dead. The *Orationes de tempore* are only to be omitted when a double feast is commemorated. Such

is the plain and evident meaning of the paragraph; there is no reference, direct or indirect, to the *Oratio imperata* any more than there is, for example, to the Prayer of the Blessed Sacrament when prescribed by the rubrics.

3. We are of opinion that, for the reason mentioned, one of the *Orationes imperatae* may be omitted.

4. It will be seen from the following answer¹ of the Congregation of Rites that the practice followed by our correspondent is no longer allowed:—

Q. Quoties exposito SSmo Sacramento canitur Hymus *Te Deum* in omnibus functionibus, expresse per Rubricas et Decreta non directis, ac datur in fine cum eodem Sanctissimo Benedictio; utrum versiculi, qui citantur in Decreto Sacrae Rituum Congregationis n. 2956, 11 Septembris 1847, Veronen., ad III, dici cum oratione *Deus, cujus misericordiae* debeant, ante Hymnum *Tantum Ergo*; an potius duo Hymni sint coniungendi, et absolvendi cum solo versiculo *Panem de coelo* et duabus orationibus SSmi Sacramenti et actionis gratiarum, sub una conclusione?

R. Affirmative ad primam partem; negative ad secundam.

A confirmation of this answer was given² on June 8, 1911.

INDULGENCES FOR TEMPERANCE AND TOTAL ABSTINENCE SOCIETIES

REV. DEAR SIR,—In your August (1914) issue³ you gave a list of indulgences recently granted by Pius X in favour of total abstainers. On February 3, 1878, Pius IX granted, and on June 6, 1886, Leo XIII confirmed, the following indulgences to members of the League of the Cross:—

A. *Plenary*.—(1) On the day of joining the League; (2) on the feast of St. Patrick; (3) on the feast of St. John the Baptist; (4) on the feast of Our Lady of Mercy; (5) for keeping the 'Truce of St. Patrick'; (6) for keeping the 'Truce of Christmas.'

B. *Partial*.—(1) Three hundred days to any member who shall induce another person to join the League; (2) 300 days (once a year) for keeping the rules of the League.

I think it was through Cardinal Manning that these indulgences were granted. Kindly say if these separate grants clash or co-exist. May I announce them all to my League members?

SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR.

We may point out that the indulgences granted by Pius X are not confined to *total abstainers*. They may also be gained by members of *temperance societies*.

When the new indulgences coincide with those already granted to the League of the Cross they do not cumulate. For instance,

¹ Decr. Auth., n. 5198 ad. x., Feb. 1, 1907.

² Ibid. n. 4271, ad v.

³ I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. iv. pp. 210-11.

two plenary indulgences cannot be gained by a person on the day he joins the League of the Cross—one, in virtue of the favour already granted to the League and another, in virtue of the new concessions, because he joins a total abstinence society. With this reservation 'Spiritual Director' may announce them all to his League members. The special indulgences granted in favour of the League, e.g., on St. Patrick's Day, etc., have not been withdrawn; and, of course, the further indulgences granted by Pius X may be gained by its members as well as by the members of other total abstinence or temperance societies.

USE OF THE STOLE AND BIRETTA

REV. DEAR SIR,—When do the rubrics prescribe (a) the use of the stole; (b) when the biretta?

W. J. C.

Apart from the celebration of Mass the use of the stole is prescribed (a) in conferring the sacraments; (b) in connexion with the sacramentals; (c) when the Blessed Sacrament is being exposed, put into the tabernacle, or carried, and whenever a vessel containing the Blessed Sacrament has to be touched; (d) when a priest communicates outside of Mass; (e) when a deacon receives Communion; (f) in an exsequial Office or funeral the officiating priest must wear a stole. There are certain other cases, for example, when preaching, in which, though the rubrics do not prescribe it, a priest is allowed by custom to wear a stole.

The biretta is simply a part of the ecclesiastical dress and is prescribed much in the same way as the *vestis talaris*. According to the rubrics of the Missal a priest must wear the biretta when he goes in vestments to the altar to celebrate Mass, and also on his return after the Mass is finished. The same is true of the sacred ministers in a solemn Mass. The celebrant and his ministers when they are seated during a solemn Mass should wear their birettas. During a procession of the Blessed Sacrament the biretta is not worn by anybody; but in other processions it should, or at any rate may, be worn by clerics taking part in the function. The rule generally laid down is that the celebrant and his ministers put on their birettas as soon as they leave the sanctuary; the other clergy only when they are outside the church. The clergy in choir may wear their birettas when seated, except the Blessed Sacrament is exposed. It is also laid down that a priest when walking through the church may wear his biretta, provided he is vested at least in a stole. But most of these rules are formulated rather by rubricists than by the rubrics.

THE PRAYER 'A CUNCTIS' IN ENGLAND

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly settle this difficulty about the prayer *A Cunctis*, and give a satisfactory answer to a question which has for some time troubled me.

The English *Ordo* for 1915 has the following note on page vii. : 'Supplicanti bus Archiepiscopo et episcopis Angliae die 24 Maii 1863, SS^{mus} Dominus Pius IX benigne concessit ut "donec S. Sedes declaraverit propter Angliae adjuncta Decreta ordinaria esse observanda, in SS. Suffr. atque in Or. *A Cunctis* commemoratio S. Georgii tantum fiat, omitta commemoratio aliorum SS. praeterquam in casu Ordinum Regularium quoad commem. sui Fundatoris, et salvis privilegiis a S. Sede concessis."'

But the authors of *The New Psalter and Its Use* (Longmans, 1912, pages 113-115) seem to think that as England has now ceased to be under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda the privilege has ceased. Therefore (1) Is the decree of Pius IX still in force or has the privilege ceased? (2) Has *Ireland* any special privilege in this respect?

CURE.

(1) As far as we can judge from the data supplied the reasoning of the authors of *The New Psalter and Its Use* is perfectly sound. The circumstances existing in England when the privilege was granted have been changed. That country is now subject to the ordinary laws of the Church. Hence the Holy See has practically, if not in so many words, declared 'Decreta ordinaria esse observanda.' Moreover, one of the chief reasons on account of which the privilege was granted—'the rareness of consecrated churches'—no longer holds, as the name of the titular is now to be mentioned, even though the church is only solemnly blessed.

(2) Ireland has no special privilege in this respect.

THOMAS O'DOHERTY.

DOCUMENTS

THE CLERGY ARE ORDERED BY THE HOLY FATHER TO BE MINDFUL OF THE SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL COMFORTS OF THE PRISONERS OF WAR

(December 21, 1914)

[The Holy Father, in his anxiety for the welfare of the prisoners of war, and to afford some consolation to their afflicted families, issues an order in their regard to the Bishops and priests of the Church as follows:—

(1) Bishops of dioceses in which prisoners are detained shall immediately select competent priests to have care of the prisoners. If they have no priests competent to converse with the prisoners in their own language, they are to borrow such priests from other Bishops.

(2) Priests selected for this duty shall leave nothing undone in ministering to the comforts, corporal and spiritual, of the prisoners—they are to console, to assist, to alleviate them in their every want.

(3) They shall inquire particularly of the prisoners if they have communicated with their families, and, if not, they shall persuade them to do so without delay.

(4) If the prisoners, owing to any cause, are unable to communicate with their families, the priests shall do so for them, taking every precaution that the letters reach their proper destination.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO

PRO NEGOTIIS ECCLESIASTICIS EXTRAORDINARIIS DE CURA CAPTIVORUM A CLERO HABENDA

(*Ex audientia Ss̃mi, die 21 decembris 1914*)

Ss̃mus D. N. Benedictus divina providentia Papa XV, cum vehementer doleret et angustias, quibus misere afficerentur innumerales homines teterrimo hoc bello capti, et anxietates, quibus eorundem familiae idcirco premerentur quod diu penitus de suis ignorarent, Secum animo reputavit quo pacto posset utrisque pro

facultate solacium auxiliumque afferre. Itaque me referente infra scripto Secretario S. Congregationis Negotiis Ecclesiasticis Extraordinariis curandis, ea quae sequuntur decrevit, spe fretus futurum, ut cum episcopi et clerus sancte religioseque mandata exsequantur, tum nationum rectores velint incepto huic, humanitate et christiana caritate in primis digno, pro viribus obsecundare.

I. Ordinarii dioecesum ubi captivi versantur, quam primum sacerdotes eligant, ut curam captivorum gerant, unum aut pro necessitate plures, eorum linguae satis peritos; quos, si nullos habeant intra dioecesis suae fines, ab aliis Ordinariis mutuentur. Hi vero libenter idoneos suppeditent.

II. Sacerdotes ad id munus electi nihil reliqui faciant quod ad captivorum utilitatem, tum animi, tum vitae corporisque, pertineat: consolentur, assideant, a necessitatibus variis—iisque interdum acerbissimis—allevant.

III. Exquirant praesertim et percontentur, utrum litteris, an alio modo, captivi familias de se certiores fecerint. Quod, si negaverint se fecisse, suadeant ut saltem apertas chartulas tabellarias (vulgo *cartes postales*, *Postkarten*, *Post cards*, *Pocrowyja kartocki*) statim mittant, quibus suos de propria valetudine doceant.

IV. Verum, si captivi, aut imperitia scribendi, aut ex morbo vel accepto vulnere, aut quavis alia de causa, ab simili litterarum commercio prohibeantur, sua ipsi manu delecti sacerdotes, eorum vice ac nomine, caritate permoti, scribant, et diligenter studeant ut epistolae eo tute perveniant quo destinantur.

Datum Romae, e Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis, die, mense et anno praedictis.

EUGENIUS PACELLI, *Secretarius*.

Quod Decretum ad aliquos Eños et Rños Dños Cardinales Archiepiscopos singularum nationum ab Eño et Rño Dño Cardinali a Secretis Status transmissum, sequens comitabatur.

EPISTOLA

EMINENZA REVERENDISSIMA,

L'augusto Pontefice Benedetto XV, grandemente addolorato per i mali che apporta ovunque l'immane guerra attuale, si è benignamente degnato di portare nuovamente la Sua benevola ed affettuosa attenzione sui prigionieri di guerra; e, nella Sua paterna carità, per provvedere in qualche modo al loro benessere spirituale e corporale, ha emanato in data di ieri, per mezzo della sacra Congregazione degli Affari Ecclesiastici Straordinari, un Decreto, del quale mi reco a premura di trasmettere a Vostra Eminenza Revma alcune copie.

Vostra Eminenza, assecondando il desiderio del Santo Padre, si compiaccia di far giungere una copia di tale Decreto a tutti e singoli i Vescovi di cotesta Nazione, che abbiano prigionieri di guerra nel territorio di loro giurisdizione, affinchè vogliano curare con la massima sollecitudine la fedele esecuzione del medesimo.

Credo superfluo aggiungere che, quando nel Decreto si parla di prigionieri, Sua Santità intende che non si faccia distinzione nè di religione, nè di nazione, nè di lingua; ma, se l'Eminenza Vostra lo credesse opportuno, voglia, nel trasmetterlo, dichiarare ai singoli Vescovi l'intenzione del Santo Padre, affinchè l'azione benefica dei sacerdoti indicati nel Decreto abbracci tutti gli sventurati prigionieri con la stessa estensione della carità di Gesù Cristo.

Baciandole umilissimamente le mani, passo al piacere di raffermarmi con sensi di profonda venerazione.

Dell'Eminenza Vostra Rev^{ma},

Dal Vaticano, li 22 dicembre 1914.

Uñio e Devñio Servitor vero,

P. CARD. GASPARRI.

THE FACULTIES OF CHAPLAINS OF SOLDIERS TO HEAR THE CONFESSIONS OF THE FAITHFUL DURING THE WAR

(December 18, 1914)

[By this decree such chaplains are given faculties to hear the confessions of all who approach them in the tribunal of Penance. Should the chaplains themselves become prisoners of war they have faculties to hear the confessions of all their fellow-captives.]

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

DECRETUM

DE CAPPELLANIS MILITUM QUOAD FACULTATEM AD EXCIPIENDAS
SACRAMENTALES FIDELIUM CONFESSIONES, DURANTE BELLO.

Sacra Poenitentia, providere cupiens salutem animarum, de speciali et expressa Apostolica auctoritate, benigne sic annuente sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto PP. XV, statuit ea quae sequuntur:

‘Cappellani militum, dum exercitum comitantur, possunt, durante bello, excipere confessiones sacramentales quorumcunque fidelium ad se accedentium et in eorum favorem uti facultatibus omnibus sibi pro foro conscientiae conceditis. Eadem pollent potestate praedicti cappellani militum in captivitate forte detenti in favorem omnium concaptivorum. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.’

Datum Romae in sacra Poenitentia, die 18 decembris 1914.

SERAPHINUS CARD. VANNUTELLI, *Poen. Maior.*

L. ⁷ ✠ S.

IOSEPHUS PALICA, *S. P. Secretarius.*

INDULGENCE OF THREE HUNDRED DAYS GRANTED TO ALL
WHO DEVOUTLY RECITE THE POPE'S PRAYER FOR PEACE

(January 21, 1915)

[The prayer referred to was published in a decree dated January 10, 1915, and the Official English Version appeared in the I. E. RECORD (February, 1915), p. 213.]

SUPREMA S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECRETUM

ORATIO PRO PACE A SS^{MO} D. N. PROPOSITA INDULGENTIA CCC DIERUM
DITATUR

(Die 21 ianuarii 1915)

Ss^{mus} D. N. D. Benedictus div. prov. Pp. XV, in audientia, R. P. D. Adessori S. O. impertita, benigne concedere dignatus est, ut fideles, corde saltem contrito recitantes orationem per decretum d. d. 10 ianuarii 1915, ad pacem implorandam in praesenti acerbissimo Nationum conflictu, a Sanctitate Sua propositam, indulgentiam trecentorum dierum, defunctis quocque applicabilem, quoties id egerint, consequi valeant. Praesenti perdurantibus memoratis rerum adiunctis valituro. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

✠ DONATUS, Archiep. Ephesin., *Adessor*.

THE PRIVILEGE OF ALTAR IS GRANTED FOR ALL MASSES
CELEBRATED FOR THE REPOSE OF THE SOULS OF THOSE
WHO DIED DURING THE PRESENT WAR

(January 28, 1915)

SUPREMA S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECRETUM

TRIBUITUR ALTARIS PRIVILEGIUM PRO MISSIS CELEBRATIS IN SUF-
FRAGIUM EORUM QUI, PRAESENTI BELLO PEREMPTI, IN PURGATORIO
DETINENTUR.

(Die 28 ianuarii 1915)

Ss^{mus} D. N. D. Benedictus div. prov. Pp. XV, ardenti iugiter caritatis studio permotus erga eos, qui, vita functi, iustas luunt poenas in Purgatorio degentes, in audientia R. P. D. Adessori S. Officii impertita, benigne concedere dignatus est, ut Missae omnes, quas a quocumque sacerdote in suffragium animarum illorum, qui

in praesenti exitiali bello ceciderunt et cadent, celebrari contigerit, ita illis suffragari possint, ac si in altari privilegiato celebratae fuissent. Praesenti hoc decurrente anno valituro, absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

✠ DONATUS, Archiep. Ephesinus, *Adessor*.

AN EXTENSION OF THE FACULTY OF BLESSING PIOUS OBJECTS FOR THE USE OF SOLDIERS DURING THE WAR

(February 4, 1915)

[Those who have, either directly or indirectly, obtained from the Holy See the power of blessing pious objects with the application of indulgences are not bound by the usual clause 'de consensu Ordinarii loci in quo facultas execetur,' in the exercise of their faculty on behalf of soldiers during the war.]

SUPREMA S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECRETUM

DEROGATUR A QUADAM CLAUSULA IN FAVOREM SACERDOTUM PIA
OBJECTA BENEDICENTIUM TEMPORE BELLI.

(Die 4 februarii 1915)

Ss̃mus D. N. D. Benedictus div. prov. Pp. XV, in audientia R. P. D. Adessori S. Officii impertita, benigne indulsit, ut sacerdotes quilibet, sive saeculares sive regulares, qui ab apostolica Sede, directe aut indirecte, facultatem obtinuerunt pia obiecta benedicendi cum indulgentiarum applicatione, et s. ministerium exercent apud milites nationum, hoc tempore, bello contententium, vel quomodolibet inter eos versantur, non teneantur clausula quae apponi solet: 'de consensu Ordinarii loci in quo facultas exercetur.' Praesenti valituro hac eadem rerum conditione perdurante. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

✠ DONATUS, Archiep. Ephesinus, *Adessor*.

THE SACRAMENTAL ABSOLUTION OF SOLDIERS ORDERED OUT TO BATTLE

(February 6, 1915)

[It is asked, whether soldiers called out to battle, whose great numbers prevent their being heard individually in confession, may be absolved by a general formula or common absolution, and be

admitted to Holy Communion, and the answer is in the affirmative. The chaplains, however, given the opportunity, should teach them that such absolution will not avail unless they are properly disposed and that the obligation of integral confession will remain if they shall have survived the immediate danger.]

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

DECLARATIO

DE ABSOLUTIONE IMPERTIENDA MILITIBUS AD PRAELIUM VOCATIS

Proposito huic sacrae Poenitentiariae dubio :

'An liceat milites ad praelium vocatos, antequam ad sacram Communionem admittantur, absolvere generali formula, seu communi absolutione, sine praecedente confessione, quando tantus est eorum numerus, ut singuli audiri nequeant, doloris actu debite emissio ?' eadem sacra Poenitentiariai, mature consideratis expositis, benigne sic annuente sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papa XV, respondendum esse censuit :

'Affirmative. Nihil vero obstandum quominus sic absoluti in praefatis adiunctis ad sacram Eucharistiam suscipiendam admittantur. Ne omittant vero cappellani militum, data opportunitate, eos docere absolutionem sic impertiendam non esse profuturam, nisi rite dispositi fuerint, iisdemque obligationem manere integram confessionem suo tempore peragendi, si periculum evaserint.'

Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae in sacra Poenitentiaria, die 6 februarii 1915.

CAROLUS PEROSI, *S. P. Regens.*

IOSEPHUS PALICA, *S. P. Secretarius.*

HOLY COMMUNION AND THE CELEBRATION OF MASS IN CAMP DURING THE WAR

(February 11, 1915)

[The decree states (1) that soldiers called out to battle can be admitted, '*servatis servandis*,' to Holy Communion '*per modum viatici*'; (2) that priests appointed to military service having the care of wounded or infirm soldiers may, in the absence of a church, offer the Holy Sacrifice in any suitable place, even in the open air, provided there is no danger of irreverence. In similar conditions priests under arms having no canonical impediment are allowed to celebrate Mass—but only on Sundays and holidays of obligation.]

S. CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM

DECRETUM

DE SACRA COMMUNIONE ET DE CELEBRATIONE MISSAE IN CASTRIS

Sacra Congregatio de disciplina Sacramentorum, bono animarum consulere cupiens, attentis extraordinariis praesentis belli circum-

stantiis, iisque perdurantibus, de speciali auctoritate Ss̃mi Domini nostri Benedicti Pp. XV, quae sequuntur declarat et statuit :

(1) Milites ad proelium vocatos (*i soldati sul fronte*) admitti posse, *servatis servandis*, ad S. Mensam Eucharisticam per modum Viatici.

(2) Sacerdotes militiae adscriptos qui militibus sauciis infirmisve deferendis vel curandis destinati sunt (vulgo *lecticarios* vel *infirmarios*) si in ecclesiis Missam celebrare nequeant, in quocumque loco, decenti tamen et tuto, et etiam sub dio, Sacrum litare posse, remoto quovis irreverentiae periculo : eos vero qui armis dimicant, Missam eodem modo, iisdemque sub conditionibus celebrare posse, at Dominicis tantum et diebus festis de praecepto, dummodo omnes praedicti sacerdotes nullo alio canonico impedimento irretiti sint.

Contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria sacrae Congregationis, die 11 februarii 1915.

PHILIPPUS CARD. GIUSTINI, *Praefectus*.

ALOISIUS CAPOTOSTI, Ep. Therm., *Secretarius*.

INDULGENCES GRANTED TO THOSE DEVOTING THEMSELVES TO JESUS CHRIST BY A CERTAIN EJACULATORY PRAYER

(December 3, 1914)

[To all who, devoting themselves piously to Jesus Christ and wishing to die in His love, recite the following prayer : ‘ *Jesus, I live for Thee ; Jesus, I die for Thee ; Jesus, I am Thine in life and in death, Amen* ’—the Holy Father grants an indulgence of 100 days, *toties quoties*. To all who recite it daily, for a month, and, having confessed and received the Blessed Eucharist, have visited a church or public oratory and prayed for the Pope’s intentions, a plenary indulgence is granted. The indulgences are applicable to the Holy Souls.]

SUPREMA S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECRETUM

CONCEDUNTUR INDULGENTIAE SE PER QUANDAM ORATIONEM D.N.I.C.
DEVOVENTIBUS

(Die 3 decembris 1914)

Ss̃mus D. N. D. Benedictus div. prov. Pp. XV, in audientia R. P. D. Adessori S. Officii impertita, benigne concedere dignatus est, ut omnes et singuli fideles, qui se Iesu Christo pie vovent, simulque mortem in eiusdem amore obire peroptant, sequentem oratiunculam recitantes : ‘ *Iesu, tibi vivo—Iesu, tibi morior—Iesu, tuus sum ego in vita et in morte. Amen,* ’ quoties id fecerint, Indul-

gentiam centum dierum, defunctis quoque adplicabilem, lucrari possint; qui vero id quotidie per integrum mensem peregerint, si confessi ac S. Communione refecti aliquam ecclesiam vel publicum oratorium visitaverint, ibique ad mentem Summi Pontificis preces fuderint, semel Indulgentiam plenariam, similiter adplicabilem, consequi valeant. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

✠ DONATUS, Archiep. Ephesin., *Adessor*.

DECREE OF BEATIFICATION OR DECLARATION OF THE MARTYRDOM OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD, DERMOT O'HURLEY, ARCHBISHOP OF CASHEL; CORNELIUS O'DEVANY, OF THE ORDER OF ST. FRANCIS, BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR; TERENCE ALBERT O'BRIEN, OF THE ORDER OF PREACHERS, BISHOP OF EMLY, AND THEIR COMPANIONS

(February 12, 1915)

**SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM
DUBLINEN.**

DECRETUM BEATIFICATIONIS SEU DECLARATIONIS MARTYRII SERVORUM DEI DERMITHI O'HURLEY ARCHIEPISCOPI CASSELIENSIS, CORNELII O'DEVANY, ORDINIS S. FRANCISCI, EPISCOPI DUNENSIS ET CONNORENSIS, TERENCE ALBERTI O'BRIEN, ORD. PRAEDIC., EPISCOPI IMOLACENSIS, ET SOCIORUM.

In Hibernia, heroum nutrice, exorta saeculis XVI et XVII effrenata et furiosa adversus catholicos persecutione, praeter innumeros Christi athletas qui in ea occubuerunt et quorum nomina, mortalibus ignota, scripta sunt in libro Vitae, complures, nomine et fama noti, in hominum memoria adhuc vivunt. Inter hos numerantur quatuordecim Ecclesiae praesules, multi sacerdotes cleri saecularis, aliique viri ad religiosas familias seu ordines pertinentes, nempe Praemonstratensium, Cisterciensium, Praedicatorum, Franciscalium, Augustinianensium, Carmelitarum, Ssmae Trinitatis et Societatis Iesu, necnon laici ac nobiles personae, quibus accedunt sex piaae mulieres. Quorum martyrii opinio cum satis constans visa sit, informativi processus in ecclesiastica curia Dublinensi adornati sunt super ipsa fama martyrii et signis aut miraculis praefatorum Servorum Dei. Hos vero processus, Romam ad sacram Rituum Congregationem delatos, secutae sunt plures litterae postulatoriae Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum, praesertim Hiberniae, aliorumque virorum ecclesiastica vel civili dignitate praestantium. Quumque omnia in promptu essent, instante R. P. D. Michaële O'Riordan, protonotario apostolico,

collegii Hibernorum in Urbe moderatore et Causae postulatore, totius Hiberniae catholicae vota depromente, Eñus et Rñus dñus cardinalis Vincentius Vannutelli, episcopus Praenestinus et eiusdem Causae Ponens seu Relator, in Ordinario sacrorum Rituum Congregationis coetu subsignata die ad Vaticanum habito, sequens dubium discutiendum proposuit : *An sit signanda Commissio introductionis Causae, in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur?* Et Eñi ac Rñi Patres sacris tuendis Ritibus propositi, post relationem ipsius Eñi Ponentis, audito voce et scripto R. P. D. Alexandro Verde, sanctae Fidei Promotore, omnibus maturo examine discussis ac perpensis, rescribendum censuerunt : *Signandam esse, si Sanctissimo placuerit, Commissionem de biscentum quinquagintaseptem Servis Dei, nempe : Ex Archiepiscopis : Dermotius O'Hurley archiepiscopus Casseliensis, Richardus Creagh archiepiscopus Armachanus, Edmundus MacGauran archiepiscopus Armachanus, Malachias O'Queely archiepiscopus Tuamensis, omnes e clero saeculari.—Ex Episcopis : Mauritius O'Brien episcopus Imolacensis, Redmundus Gallagher episcopus Derriensis, cum tribus sociis, Edmundus Dungan, tertiarius Ordinis S. Francisci, episcopus Dunensis et Connorensis, Heber MacMahon episcopus Clogherensis, Eugenius MacEgan episcopus designatus Rossensis, omnes e clero saeculari; Gulielmus Walsh ex ordine Cisterciensium, episcopus Medensis, Patricius O'Healy episcopus Mayensis, Cornelius O'Devany episcopus Dunensis et Connorensis, Boëtius Egan episcopis Rossensis, omnes ex Ordine S. Francisci; Terentius Albertus O'Brien, ex ordine Praedicatorum, episcopus Imolacensis.—Ex sacerdotibus saecularibus : Eugenius Cronin, Laurentius O'More, Richardus French, Aeneas Penny, Ioannes O'Grady, Mauritius O'Kenraghty, Andreas Stritch, Bernardus Moriarty, Ioannes Stephens, Gualterius Ternan, Georgius Power vicarius generalis, Ioannes Walsh vicarius generalis, Nicolaus Young, Daniel O'Moloney, Donough O'Cronin clericus, Ioannes O'Kelly, Brian Murchertagh, Donough O'Falvey, Bernardus O'Carolan, Donatus MacCried, Patricius O'Derry, Ioannes Lune, Patricius O'Loughran, Ludovicus O'Lavery, Philippus Cleary, Henricus White, Theobaldus Stapleton, Eduardus Stapleton, Thomas Morrissey, Thomas Bath, Rogerius Ormilus, Hugo Carrigi, Bernardus Fitzpatrick, Daniel Delaney, Daniel O'Brien, Iacobus Murchu, Iacobus O'Hegarty.—Ex Ordine Praemonstratensi : Ioannes Kieran vel Mulcheran.—Ex Ordine Cisterciensium : Gelasius O'Cullenan, Nicolaus Fitzgerald, Prior et socii coenobii S. Salvatoris, Patricius O'Connor, Malachias O'Kelly, Abbas et monachi Coenobii Magiensis, Eugenius O'Gallagher, Bernardus O'Treivir, Iacobus Eustace, Malachias Shiel, Edmundus Mulligan, Lucas Bergin.—Ex Ordine Praedicatorum : P. MacFerge cum sociis, Triginta duo religiosi conventus*

Londonderryensis, Ioannes O'Luin, Donough O'Luin, Guilelmus Mac Gollen, Petrus O'Higgins, Cormac MacEgan, Raymundus Keogh, Richardus Barry, Ioannes O'Flaverty, Geraldus Fitzgerald, David Fox, Donald O'Neaghten, Iacobus O'Reilly, Dominicus Dillon, Richardus Oveton, Stephanus Petit, Petrus Costello, Gulielmus Lynch, Myler MacGrath, Laurentius O'Ferral, Bernardus O'Ferral, Ambrosius Aeneas O'Cahill, Edmundus O'Beirne, Iacobus Woulf, Vincentius Gerardus Dillon, Iacobus Moran, Donatus Niger, Gulielmus O'Connor, Thomas O'Higgins, Ioannes O'Cullen, avid Roche, Bernardus O'Kelly, Thaddaeus Moriarty, Hugo MacGoill, Raymundus O'Moore, Felix O'Connor, Ioannes Keating, Clemens O'Callaghan, Daniel MacDonnell, Felix MacDonnell, Dominicus MacEgan.—*Ex Ordine S. Francisci*: Conor Macuarta, Rogerus Congaill, Fergallus Ward, Edmundus Fitzsimon, Donough O'Rourke, Ioannes O'Lochran, Cornelius O'Rourke, Thaddaeus aut Thomas O'Daly, Ioannes O'Dowd, Daniel O'Neilan, Philippus O'Lea, Mauritius O'Scanlon, Daniel Himrecan, Carolus MacGoran, Rogerus O'Donnellan, Petrus O'Quillan, Patricius O'Kenna, Iacobus Pillanus, Rogerus O'Hanlan, Felimeus O'Hara, Henricus Delahoyde, Thaddaeus O'Meran, Ioannes O'Daly, Donatus O'Hurley, Ioannes Cornelius, Dermitius O'Mulroney, Frater Thomas cum socio, Ioannes O'Molloy, Cornelius O'Dogherty, Calfridus O'Farrel, Thaddaeus O'Boyle, Patricius O'Brady, Matthaeus O'Leyn, Terentius Macmepp, Lochlonin Mac O'Cadha, Magnus O'Fodhry, Thomas Fitzgerald, Ioannes Honan, Ioannes Cathan, Franciscus O'Mahony, Hilarius Conroy, Christophorus Dunlevy, Richardus Butler, Iacobus Saul, Bernardus Horumley, Richardus Synnot, Ioannes Esmond, Paulinus Synnot, Raymundus Stafford, Petrus Stafford, Didacus Cheevers, Ioseph Rochford, Eugenius O'Leman, Franciscus Fitzgerald, Antonius Musaeus, Gualterus de Wallis, Nicolaus Wogan, Dionysius O'Neilan, Philippus Flasberry, Franciscus O'Sullivan, Ieremias de Nerihiny, Thaddaeus O'Caraghy, Gulielmus Hickey, Rogerius de Mara, Hugo MacKeon, Daniel Clanchy, Neilan Loughran, Antonius O'Farrel, Antonius Broder, Eugenius O'Cahan, Ioannes Ferall, Bonaventura de Burgo, Ioannes Kearney, Bernardus Connaeus.—*Ex Ordine S. Augustini*: Thaddaeus O'Connel, Augustinus Higgins, Petrus Taffe, Gulielmus Tirrey, Donatus O'Kennedy, Donatus Serenan, Fulgentius Jordan, Raymundus O'Malley, Thomas Tullis, Thomas Deir.—*Ex Ordine Carmelitano*: Thomas Aquinas a Iesu, Angelus a S. Iosepho, Petrus a Matre Dei.—*Ex Ordine Ssm̃ae Trinitatis*: Cornelius O'Connor, Eugenius O'Daly.—*Ex Societate Iesu*: Edmundus MacDaniell, Dominicus O'Collins, Gulielmus Boyton, Robertus Netterville, Ioannes Bath.—*Ex laicis ac nobilibus*: Gulielmus Walsh, Oliverius Plunkett, Daniel Sutton, Ioannes Sutton,

Robertus Sherlock, Matthaeus Lamport, Robertus Myler, Eduardus Cheevers, Ioannes O'Lahy, Patricius Canavan, Patricius Hayes, Daniel O'Hannan, Mauritius Eustace, Robertus Fitzgerald, Gualterus Eustace, Thomas Eustace, Christophorus Eustace, Gulielmus Wogan, Gualterus Alymer, Thaddaeus Clancy, Petrus Meyler, Christophorus Roche, Michaël Fitzsimon, Patricius Browne, Thomas MacCreith, Ioannes de Burgo, Brian O'Neil, Arthurus O'Neil, Rodrigus O'Kane, Godefridus O'Kane, Alexander MacSorley, Franciscus Tailler, Hugo MacMahon, Cornelius Maguire, Donatus O'Brien, Iacobus O'Brien, Bernardus O'Brien, Daniel O'Brien, Dominicus Fanning, Daniel O'Higgin, Thomas Stritch, Ludovicus O'Ferral, Galfridus Galway, Patricius Purcell, Theobaldus de Burgo, Galfridus Baronius, Thaddaeus O'Connor Sligo, Ioannes O'Connor, Bernardus MacBriody, Felix O'Neil, Eduardus Butler.—*Ex feminis* : Eleonora Birmingham, Elisabetha Kearney, Margarita de Cashel, Brigida Darcey, Honoria de Burgo, Honoria Magan.—Quoad reliquos Dei Servos viginti tres : *Dilata et coadiuventur probationes.* Die 9 februarii 1915.

Facta postmodum de his sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papae XV per subscriptum sacrae Rituum Congregationis Secretarium relatione, Sanctitas Sua rescriptum eiusdem sacri Consilii ratum habens, propria manu signare dignata est Commissionem Introductionis Causae biscentum quinquaginta septem praefatorum Servorum Dei, die 12, eisdem mense et anno.

ANTONIUS CARD. VICO, *S. R. C. Pro-Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, Ep. Charystien., *Secretarius.*

REVIEWS AND NOTES

THE GOLDEN LEGEND: LIVES OF THE SAINTS. Translated by William Caxton from the Latin of Jacobus de Voragine. Selected and edited by George V. O'Neill, S.J., M.A., Professor of English, University College, Dublin. Cambridge: University Press. 1914.

FATHER O'NEILL has given us in this work a charming selection from one of the most popular books of medieval times. The author, Jacobus de Voragine, was born in 1228 at Voraggio, not far from Genoa. He joined the Dominicans, held responsible positions in the Order, and finally, against his will, was elected Archbishop of Genoa. A man of gentle disposition and of literary tastes he found himself in his later years cast amidst the turbulent politics of Guelph and Ghibelline. He died in 1298 at the age of seventy. The *Legenda Aurea*, or Golden Legend, is, as Father O'Neill points out, an admirable introduction to the general taste of the medieval peoples. The separation of Romance from History and Science, which is such a mark of our modern day, had not then taken place. If we are, therefore, to get the full value of a work like this we must approach it, not in the querulous manner of a scientific specialist, but in the temper of a Renaissance poet, in quest of poetic material. Its imaginative truth is to be sought rather than its truth to fact. To students of English, Caxton's work will make appeal as a specimen of literary prose, and to the Catholic student it will recall the days when England still held communion with the great world of Catholic literature. It is a good sign to see this old Catholic work appearing under the editorship of an Irish Jesuit and under the sign of the Cambridge Press. Father O'Neill acknowledges his indebtedness to the complete edition of Caxton's work brought out by Mr. F. S. Ellis and Messrs. Dent in 1900, and also to the translation into French by Theodor de Wyzewa. De Wyzewa, whose work was crowned by the French Academy, is one of the band of Catholic literary men who are striving to revive in France Catholic spirituality in the domain of literature. To all who love the union of verbal precision and beauty with Catholic truth his works may be heartily recommended. Father O'Neill says, in his Introduction,

that his 'object has been to prepare a volume for popular though not unscholarly reading.' In attaining that object he has been most successful. He has not sought to meet the requirements of the literary antiquary, but has given us a text which all may read with pleasure, together with an admirable series of notes dealing with the historical and topographical allusions in the text and, where necessary, with its verbal difficulties.

P. M. MACSWEENEY.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF ST. COLUMBAN (542-615). By George Metlake. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press.

'DURING the sixth and seventh centuries,' says Döllinger, 'the Church of Ireland stood in the full beauty of its bloom. The spirit of the Gospel operated amongst the people with a vigorous and vivifying power. There was no country of the world, during this period, which could boast of pious foundations or of religious communities equal to those that adorned this far distant land. The schools in the Irish cloisters were at this time the most celebrated in all the West, whilst almost the whole of Europe was desolated by war; peaceful Ireland, free from the invasions of external foes, opened to the lovers of learning and piety a welcome asylum.' The adventurous Celt, in his thirst for knowledge and piety, journeyed from school to school, with his satchel of books thrown over his shoulder, a leathern water-bottle slung by his side, and a crooked staff in his hand, to find a master of the arts and of the ascetic life to correspond to his own ideal. Such a wandering scholar was Columban of Laigin and such an ideal master of the classics, of the Scriptures, and of the ascetic life, was Comgall of Bangor. From the monastery at Bangor Columban, with his little band of white-robed monks, went forth on his arduous mission to the Gaul, the Frank, and the Alamannian, and became, both on account of his personality and his work, one of the most remarkable of Eire's saints and scholars.

For our knowledge of the career of St. Columbanus we are indebted to a son of classic Italy. Jonas, his biographer, entered the monastery of Bobbio just three years after the death of its saintly founder, visited the various scenes of his labours, and spoke to the companions of his earthly pilgrimage. His life of our saint is one of the most important historical documents of the seventh century. Probably on no other hagiographical document of the Middle Ages has so much erudition, so much conscientiousness and painstaking editorial labour been bestowed as on the *Vita Sancti Columbani*. Every phase of his varied activity—as a monastic legislator, as a herald of the Gospel, as an apostle of the sacrament of Penance, as

a patron and promoter of intellectual culture, and of the arts of peace in an age of blood and iron—has been carefully investigated. His writings have been edited by men who enjoy an international reputation for scholarship and critical acumen. Thus, after thirteen hundred years, the influence of his powerful personality on the religious and social life of the seventh century is at last receiving due recognition. *The Life of St. Columban* before us, by George Metlake, collects for us, in its two hundred and sixty pages, all the erudition that has been expended on our saint and his writings. It is a most interesting and fascinating work, beautifully written, and neatly turned out. It is a scholarly work, critical yet sympathetic. It evinces a thorough, intimate knowledge of the social and political history of European countries during the early Middle Ages. In all the wanderings of Columban, Metlake paints for us in vivid colours the background of the pictures: the varied scenes and pursuits of life, the gentle slopes of the Vosges mountains and the snow-clad Pennine peaks, the smiling verdant valleys of the Meuse and the Moselle, the placid lake and mountain torrent; the courts of the kings and the bee-hive cells of the monks; the brilliant array of warriors and princes, peasantry and princesses, and the severe processions of the coarsely-clad monks. But in all his pictures he depicts with a master-hand the fiery, impetuous, zealous, obstinate, yet saintly and kind personality of Columban, standing out in bold contrast to his surroundings. We see him as a young man, leaping over the prostrate form of his mother who threw herself in sheer despair upon the threshold of her home to prevent his following the call of his Master. We see him, like another John the Baptist, face with fiery zeal the threats and tortures of the licentious King Theoderic and the cruel Brunhilde. We witness the same Christian courage leading him to join issue even with Popes Gregory and Boniface on the ‘Paschal Controversy’ and on the question of the celebrated ‘Three Chapters.’ We should prefer if he had never entered into these discussions. However, it was his impulsive and overbearing love for the ancient customs of his native land in the one case, and, in the other, his zeal for the triumph of truth and for the honour of the Holy See, which misguided his pen. That must be our apology for him. Yet, in his passionate outbursts, we have something to be thankful for. His protestations of filial obedience and of submission to the Holy See furnish splendid testimonies to the primacy of the Roman See. ‘Rome,’ he says, ‘the capital of the world, is also head of all the Churches.’

Notwithstanding the severity of his ‘Penitential Discipline’ and the austerity of his ‘Monastic Rule,’ yet under the Celtic

pilgrim's somewhat harsh and brusque exterior beat a heart full of tenderness and compassion for suffering and erring humanity. His letters and his poems to a 'Young Friend,' to Hunald, Sethus, and Fidolius, reveal all the tenderness and sympathy of his kind heart for his disciples who had gone out from the peaceful shelter of the monastery into the cruel and troubled world of the day. The eagerness of his monks to share his exile when he was driven from his monastery at Luxeuil by the tyrannical Theoderic and Brunhilde, the respect, honour, and favours lavished upon him by Frankish and Lombardian courts, are proofs of the wonderful fascination of that severe yet kind personality. The respect and veneration of the people, especially of the poor and the afflicted, who flocked to his tomb in the little church at Bobbio, the numerous miracles by which God early glorified his memory, are abundant witnesses of the saintly life of the 'Celtic Dove.'

'The bodies of the saints,' says Benedict XIV, 'by the grace of the divine mercy always prove a powerful protection for the cities where they repose and are held in veneration.' These words of the great Pontiff have been verified in a remarkable degree in the case of Bobbio. Heresy, impiety, socialism, and other plagues which commit such dreadful ravages elsewhere have not found their way into its green valleys. Like their own century-old castle tower, which never shakes its summit for blasts of wind, the people of Bobbio have stood firm in the faith of their patron saint, San Colombano.

The Fathers are in dust, yet live to God,
 So says the truth ; as if the motionless clay
 Still held the seeds of life beneath the sod,
 Smouldering and struggling till the judgment day.

And hence we learn with reverence to esteem
 Of these frail houses, though the grave confines ;
 Sophist may urge his cunning tests, and deem
 That they are earth ; but they are heavenly shrines.
 —NEWMAN, *Relics of Saints*.

M. R.

THE HISTORY OF IRELAND. By Geoffrey Keating, D.D. Vol. IV.
 Edited by Rev. Patrick Dinneen, M.A. London : David Nutt.
 1914.

FATHER DINNEEN has placed all students of the Irish Language and of Irish History under a deep debt of gratitude by his edition of Keating's History. Without critically pronouncing on the historical value of Keating's work, it is safe to say that he holds in relation to Modern Irish Literature the position which the authors

of the Revised Version hold in English Literature. His work is a focus-point in the Irish Language. In the present volume we have what may be considered the Appendix to the History: the Genealogies and Synchronisms, and an Index, which includes the elucidation of Place Names and annotations to Vols. I, II, III. The present volume is, therefore, in the main, genealogical and topographical. It provides a thousand and one starting-points for critical excursions into the realms of Irish history. Through Father Hogan's monumental *Onomasticon*, and such a volume as this, the serious student is already well provided with material for special inquiry. It is to be hoped that such students will be found in increasing numbers, ready to critically sift the large mass of even printed material which now lies to hand. The scientific investigation of the history and origin of one tribe or clan would open the way to a truer perspective into Early Irish History. Meanwhile we must be deeply grateful to men like Father Hogan and Father Dinneen, who have quarried the rough material and brought it to the surface, ready to be shaped into many a valuable and exhaustive though more restricted work.

P. M. MACSWEENEY.

AN IRISH CORPUS ASTRONOMIAE. Edited by Rev. F. W. O'Connell, M.A., B.D., and R. M. Henry, M.A. London: David Nutt. 1915.

It is a promising sign of the breadth of intellectual outlook in Queen's University, Belfast, to find the names of Canon O'Connell and Professor Henry, as joint editors of this *Irish Corpus Astronomiae*. We learn from the title-page that the author of the original work was Geronymo Cortes, a Spaniard in the city of Valencia, and that the Irish version—which is here edited, with Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Glossary—was made by Father Manus O'Donnell in the year 1694. Father O'Donnell, it would appear, was a student at Salamanca during the latter half of the seventeenth century, but this is all the information that is available so far concerning him.

Professor Henry contributes a very readable Introduction and also a valuable collection of Notes, dealing very capably with some of the scientific and historical points raised in the text, and supplying many apt quotations from Greek and Latin authors. To Canon O'Connell we are presumably indebted for the transcription and translation of the Irish text, its collation with the Spanish original, and a series of useful notes on the Irish text. The book is further enriched with a Glossary of astrological terms (English), and another explaining the rarer Irish words occurring in the text, and also those which are used in a technical sense. The work is thus very

thoroughly done, and to these two professors of Queen's University, Belfast, the Irish world is indebted for a very scholarly edition of a most interesting text. It is not for us to say anything of the scientific value of the Spanish original. The Irish translation, as Professor Henry remarks, 'is a fresh example of the pathetic devotion to learning which, amid obstacles that might almost have seemed unsurmountable, marked the Irish nation' (Intro. p. xxii.) 'Denied the advantages of opportunities for the higher learning at home, Irish scholars and ecclesiastics were forced to seek such opportunities upon the Continent, and characteristically tried to make available for their less fortunate countrymen who remained in Ireland the savour of those fruits which they themselves had first tasted in exile' (ibid.). Irish readers whose knowledge of Astronomy has been brought abreast of the time will not be offended by the scientific errors to be met with in this Irish text. For them the book will have mainly a literary and linguistic interest. The language of the text has been correctly described by Canon O'Donnell as Classical Early Modern. It will probably surprise some of our present-day critics of Modern Irish to find forms and usages in this seventeenth-century text which they decry as corruptions and monstrosities dating from the 'Revival' period. The editing of such early texts will do much to remove a great deal of ignorance and misconception, and develop saner views regarding the legitimate development of the language. For this result alone we shall have much for which to thank the Editors.

We append here just a few of the examples of the kind referred to: *Δη τ-αμ ζυρ β' ιονανν ραο ρον λά γ ρον οιοθε* (p. 4); *υράιο* (p. 8); *υιήρι* (p. 8); *ιρ έ ριν ρε ράο* (p. 8); *ρυαίρ ρέ αμαε* (p. 8); *ρυλ ριζ* (p. 16). These examples might easily be multiplied.

We have only to add that the book has been admirably produced by Messrs. Mayne, Boyd and Son, Ltd., Belfast, Printers to Queen's University, Belfast.

Βεατα βρεανωαν. By *Seán Ua Ceallaiḡ.* Dublin: M.H. Gill & Son, Ltd. 1915.

A NARRATIVE of the life and wanderings of Brendan 'the Voyager' in any language is bound to be interesting reading. The book under notice has the advantage of being written in Irish, by an Irishman full of enthusiasm for his subject, and possessed of special gifts to enable him to treat that subject in the proper spirit. This *Life of St. Brendan*, then, by *Seán Ua Ceallaiḡ*, needs no further introduction to commend it to Irish readers who are interested in the history of their country, especially in its ecclesiastical aspects. Mr. O'Kelly gives us in this little book well-thought-out chapters

on the early life of our Saint, and on the three voyages, together with a particularly enthralling account of certain manners and customs of Mexico which reflect portion of the early Irish Christian civilisation; while the titles of the remaining chapters—*Θειρεσθ δ Σδοταρι* (V), *Τορισθ δ Σδοταρι* *αδυρ ιομπαμα αν τSean-Σδοξαιλ* (VII), *Τειρτεαρ να n-υξοαρ* (VIII), *Τυλλεσθ Τειρτιρ*; *Λεαρρεαλα δριρα ιρ δ λειτέιο* (IX)—indicate fairly well the scope of Mr. O'Kelly's work. The book is written in a clear, free, and flexible style, and though here and there it recalls the flavour of earlier Modern Irish, there is no pedantic use of archaic forms. In preparing his material the author has been careful and painstaking, the bibliographical index showing a number, though not all, of the books, MSS., etc., which he has consulted. There is a useful vocabulary at the end of the text, which explains the majority of the words in Irish, and there are also indices of the Personal and Place-Names which occur in the course of the narrative. Mr. O'Kelly is to be congratulated on producing a work which ought to be well received by the general Irish reading public, and which we hope to see take a place as a text-book on some of our educational programmes.

G. O'N.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

- America*: A Catholic Review (March).
The Ecclesiastical Review (March). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (March). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (March). New York.
The Austral Light (February). Melbourne.
The Ave Maria (February). Notre Dame, Indiana.
The Irish Monthly (March). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Catholic Bulletin (March). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (March). London: Longmans.
Our Boys (March). Edited by Christian Brothers, Dublin.
Studies (March). Dublin: Educational Co. of Ireland.
Missionary Record of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate (March). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Universe—Catholic Weekly (March). London.
Foundation Stones of a Great Diocese (Pittsburg). By Rev. A. A. Lambing, LL.D. Vol. I. Wilkinsburg.
Irish Manufacturers' Directory, 1915. Dublin: Dollard.
A Historical Introduction to Ethics. By Rev. Thomas Werner Moore, Ph.D. New York: American Book Co.
The History of England. By John Lingard, D.D., and Hilaire Belloc. Vol. XI. London: Sands & Co.
Spiritual Letters. By Mgr. R. Hugh Benson. London: Longmans.
The Elder Miss Ainsborough. By M. A. Taggart. New York: Benziger.
Irish Messenger Series, Great Denmark Street, Dublin: *St. Joseph*, by Rev. J. M'Donnell, S.J.; *The Holy Hour*, by Rev. J. M'Donnell, S.J.; *The Ethics of War*, by Rev. E. Masterson, S.J.; *The European Crisis*, by J. P. Boland, M.P.; *Scenes from the Passion*, by Rev. J. M'Donnell, S.J.; *Life of St. Patrick*, by E. Leahy; *The Soldier Priests of France*, by Comtesse de Courson; *Easter with Christ and His Friends*, by S. M. M.; *The Little Flower of Jesus*.
The Brown Scapular, by Rev. Berthold Mulleady, O.D.C. Dublin: James Duffy & Co.

SOME LANDMARKS OF JANSENISM

BY REV. FATHER ALFRED, O.S.F.C.

THE vigorous days of Jansenism may be placed between the publication of the *Augustinus*, in 1640, and the reception of the Bull *Unigenitus*, in 1713. Having occupied the stage for some seventy-five years, it continued a precarious existence behind the scenes for several years thereafter; but its original founders would hardly have recognised the child of their dream in the later developments of Jansenism, and though even to-day there exists a Jansenistic body, it is a lifeless concern, a curiosity rather than a living force.¹

Disclaiming any attempt to lead the reader through the shoals and cross-currents of the great controversy, I will yet endeavour to point out a few landmarks; to indicate, in other words, a few of the great figures and the main events of the period. That period was one of intense strife, during which, it must be confessed, the combatants on either side fought with a bitterness scarcely equalled in later Church history. Writing of this struggle, a modern critic has said: 'One may be sublimely charitable in a time of plague and yet lose one's temper in a simple theological dispute with our neighbour.'²

But, then, Jansenism was a heresy, and struck at the very roots of the Christian life, its close imitation of Catholic asceticism made it all the more dangerous, whilst its disciples appeared pillars of virtue amidst the social corruption around them. *Sed in omnibus charitas*. Two points,

¹ Besides the Jansenist sees in Holland, where the whole sect numbers about 6,000, there is to-day in Paris a small church where a single Jansenist pastor has a following of perhaps a couple of hundred people.

² Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, p. 514, vol. i. bk. 2, n. 6; Paris, 1840.

however, must be borne in mind : (a) we are dealing with Frenchmen, for the most part, and (b) in an age when the critical spirit was only just seeing the light. These two facts will, to a large extent, explain much of the *furor theologicus* that was vented throughout the entire period.

Jansenism came into being when Cornelius Janssen and his friend du Vergier de Hauranne,¹ better known as the Abbé of St. Cyran, put their heads together and resolved to give to the world the true doctrine of St. Augustine upon Grace, which they deemed had not been until their day properly understood, or at least had been lost sight of in the course of centuries. It was chiefly at St. Cyran's instigation that Janssen had undertaken the task of examining the whole Augustinian theory of Grace. The two friends, living quietly in the country at Bayonne, spent five years (1611-16) at the task ; St. Cyran, who was well-off, supplying the necessary books. It may be true that neither Janssen nor his friend imagined that the whole of Europe would be stirred by the results of their labours, but whether they foresaw or not the storm they were to let loose, the foundation of Jansenism must be laid to their charge. There is evidence that both were conscious that their work would meet with opposition and they were slow in producing the great treatise. Janssen had been called from Bayonne to be Bishop of Ypres, but he died in 1638, two years before his *Augustinus* was published. St. Cyran, however, lived to see the publication of the work, which first appeared at Louvain in 1640.

As regards the death of Janssen, or Jansenius, as he was generally called throughout the controversy, the more credible account is that it was quite that of a good Christian. In the preface to his *Augustinus* he submitted the whole work to the judgment of the Holy See, and in his last moments he is said to have solemnly repeated the declaration.² A second edition of the book appeared at

¹ Janssen was born in Holland in 1585, his friend at Bayonne in 1581.

² Even P. Rapin, S.J., gives Jansenius the credit of this declaration ; cf. *Histoire du Jansénisme*, l. 8, p. 370 ; Paris : Domenech, 1861.

Paris with certain approbations in 1641, but at this time St. Cyran was in prison, thanks to Cardinal Richelieu. Many reasons are alleged for this imprisonment: St. Cyran's well-known connexion with Jansenius, who was the reputed author of a pamphlet called the *Mars gallicus*, in which a fierce attack upon Richelieu's foreign policy had been made, and the fact that in his theological views St. Cyran differed from the Cardinal. The more probable reason, however, was that St. Cyran refused the patronage which Richelieu, fearing the silent strength of the man, proffered.

At the death of the Cardinal, in 1642, the Abbé was released, but did not enjoy his liberty long, for he died in the following year; having, in all probability, done more for the propagation of Jansenism than the author of the *Augustinus* himself.

St. Cyran was certainly an extraordinary character and the type of all future Jansenists—clever, ascetic, ardent, and bitter.¹ At the monastery of Port-Royal, where Mère Angélique was continuing her work of reform, he had been in great demand, and undoubtedly it was due to St. Cyran that Jansenism took root in this choice community, of which he became the director in 1636. He had become acquainted with the nuns of Port-Royal through Arnauld d'Audilly, the brother of Mère Angélique, who conceived a profound admiration for the gloomy theologian and soon introduced him to his sister as a man of true religion.² When, later on, he was installed as *the* Director at Port-Royal, the sisters Arnauld (three of them at least) became his fervent disciples. St. Francis de Sales had also known Mère Angélique, but his sunny spirit was eclipsed by the austere gloom that surrounded the Abbé of St. Cyran. Port-Royal imbibed the latter's rigorism, and so it came about that this monastery was soon regarded as the stronghold of Jansenism, and some were even led to think that the two were identical. It would, however, be more correct

¹ Sainte-Beuve says of him that he was one of 'those who burn but do not illuminate'; l.c., l. i. n. xi. p. 287.

² Rapin, l.c., l. ii. p. 107.

to say that, whilst the *Augustinus* and St. Cyran, with the entire school of his masculine followers and successors, presented Jansenism theoretically or dogmatically, the nuns at Port-Royal showed in their lives the practical Jansenism. At the same time it is well to remember that, on the one hand, these theologians and writers themselves lived ascetical lives and, on the other, the nuns were sometimes more than budding theologians. Of St. Cyran we are told¹ that he was interested neither in literature nor history, and nature itself had no attraction for him; he was above all the director of souls. In reality this is where he proved such a gigantic failure: his penchant for mastering the souls that confided in him quite destroying anything like responsible piety. He conquered or imposed by the sheer force of his personality, but at the expense of the individual soul.

After St. Cyran there came another director of the same mould, the Père Singlin, who was, however, chiefly famous as a preacher: the forerunner, in style at least, of Bourdaloue. His sermons, delivered always at the chapel of Port-Royal, had such effect upon his hearers that they would not stay afterwards to gossip outside, but went straight home much edified. One wonders if this be the test of a good preacher in our own days.

It was in 1642 that the storm gathering about the *Augustinus* first broke. The theologians at Paris and elsewhere, who were interested in questions of Grace, warmed to the task and brought forth presently the first Bull directed against the work, the *In eminenti* of Urban VIII. This Bull, however, forbade the reading of the *Augustinus*, not only because it reproduced some of the errors of Baius, but also because therein *obscure questions of Grace* were discussed—which had been forbidden by the Constitutions of Pius V and Gregory XIII, after the trouble with Baius in the sixteenth century; at the same time various works, which had already appeared in answer to Jansenius, were also proscribed for the same reason.

¹ Sainte-Beuve, l.c., vol. i. l. 2, n. 1, pp. 356 seq.

As regards the composition of the *Augustinus*: the method followed by the author was by no means the scholastic but rather the historical method; pretty well all that St. Augustine had written upon the subject of Grace is arrayed in order, and Jansenius displays great skill in marshalling his texts. The first treatise consists of eight books and gives the history of the heresy of Pelagius and that of the semi-Pelagians. The second treatise concerns Paradise, Adam, the Fall and its consequences. The third deals with the question of the healing of fallen man by the grace of Christ; this is the most bulky portion of the whole work and consists of ten books. Finally, there is—what probably had most to do with the fierceness of the opposition—a comparison between the semi-Pelagians and some modern theologians.¹ The title of the work is itself an indication of the method followed: it is styled *Cornelli Jansenii Yprensis Augustinus seu doctrina S. Augustini de humane naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina, adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses*.²

After the appearance of the *Augustinus* and the consequent publication of the *In eminenti*, the next landmark is the publication of Antoine Arnauld's book, *La Fréquente Communion*, in 1643, a few weeks before St. Cyran's death. Written in very correct style, this book had a great vogue; its method, unlike the *Augustinus*, was scholastic, but the doctrine was the direct result of Jansenius' teaching. The poison of Arnauld's work has filtered down to our own day, but one trusts that the blow dealt by the late Pontiff Pius X to such pernicious doctrine was its *coup de grâce*.

Although Antoine Arnauld wrote much and correctly, he is hardly a great writer, properly speaking; he is, however, often placed at the head of the school of Port-Royal writers, but this is rather for his leadership in controversy than for his literary qualities. His was the mind that found a way out of the difficulty, when the Bull of Innocent X,

¹ In particular the schools of Lessius, Molina, and Vasquez were singled out.

² The Massilians were the semi-Pelagians, so called because they flourished chiefly at Marseilles, under Cassian, Abbot of St. Victor.

Cum occasione, in 1653, definitely condemned the Five Propositions taken from the *Augustinus*. Nicholas Cornet, Syndic of the Faculty of Theology at Paris, had extracted these propositions, as containing the substance of Janssen's teaching, from the great work, and after much discussion by the Sorbonne, Parliament, and the Assembly of the Clergy, they were sent to Rome for a final judgment.

The Bull of condemnation was only issued after a lengthy examination before a special commission; as the whole question of Grace was so difficult to precisely pronounce upon, there was ample scope for the pleading of theologians on either side. When the Bull was at length published the Jansenists were dismayed, but Arnauld was a rallying point; he propounded, or rather revived,¹ the famous distinction of fact and right. The propositions, as condemned by the Bull, were certainly heretical, according to the declaration of the Pope, but *de facto* they were not contained in the *Augustinus*, or if there, they were not used in the sense condemned. And when Alexander VII, in 1656, by the Bull *Ad sacram*, explicitly declared that the Five Propositions *were* found in the *Augustinus* and were condemned in the sense of their author,² the position taken up by the Jansenists was this: that whilst the Church had the right to demand complete submission from the faithful when defining dogmatic truths, in regard to questions of fact she has not the power to demand anything more than external and respectful silence.

This same year Arnauld was expelled from the Sorbonne and deprived of his title of doctor.³ After this he

¹ The distinction had, to a certain extent, already been employed in the days of Baius.

² Cf. Gerberon, *Histoire du Jansénisme*, tom. ii. ann. 1656, p. 316 (Amsterdam, 1700). Not the least interesting item in this work is the series of woodcuts, showing the portraits of the chief personages connected with the Jansenist controversy. Whilst several possess pleasant features it must be confessed that Janssen, St. Cyran, and Antoine Arnauld have strikingly hard countenances, the first is even somewhat repulsive.

³ With him were turned out of the Sorbonne sixty-two other Doctors: it is not then difficult to understand the enormous influence Jansenism exercised throughout France, and its permeation through two and a half centuries. Cf. Gerberon, l.c., ann. 1656, p. 283.

lived more or less apart from contact with the world, although he continued from his solitude to be a rallying centre for the Jansenists. He is generally known as the Grand Arnould—to distinguish him from the ten or fifteen other Arnoulds and their relatives, who were all more or less prominent men and women in the Jansenist world; he lived through most of the stirring days of Jansenism, and died in exile at Brussels in 1694.

The advent of Blaise Pascal and his literary genius forms another landmark in the history of Jansenism. The party was already powerful, both from a social and intellectual standpoint, but when Pascal joined his forces to those of Arnould, Lemaître, and Singlin, the Jansenists became nothing less than formidable. The usual procedure marks Pascal's arrival: he is somewhat mundane and dissipated before his conversion, nay, there is a double conversion before he falls completely into the Jansenistic scheme, but once there there is no looking back, and his talents, undoubtedly great, are henceforth devoted to the propagation and defence of all that Jansenius and St. Cyran had stood for. He was less than forty when he died (in 1662), but from a very early age he showed extraordinary powers: thus at sixteen he wrote a treatise on Conic Sections; at nineteen he invented an arithmetical machine; at twenty-three he had experimented on Space. He became attached to the Jansenists about 1646, but it was only after his second conversion, in November, 1654, that he definitely joined the society of Port-Royal-des-Champs, where the men of the Jansenist party lived as solitaries.¹

Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales*, directed, from the fourth letter onward, against the Jesuits, who were fighting Jansenism vigorously but not always prudently, commenced to appear early in 1656, and went on until the following year.² The main object of the *Lettres* was

¹ Cf. E. Boutroux, *Pascal*, chap. iv.; Paris, 1900.

² Pascal was then living in Paris and had frequently to change his quarters to avoid arrest; cf. Sainte-Beuve, l.c., vol. ii. l. iii. n. 7.

to appeal to the general public concerning a controversy wherein, up to the present, only theologians had understood the real nature of the dispute. Pascal contrasts the stern code of the Jansenists with what he deems the lax code of the Jesuits.

The *Lettres* themselves, of which eighteen appeared, formed a landmark of the quarrel. Upon them Pascal expends all his literary talent and eloquence, and pours forth in them all his feeling against the Jesuits. The style is clever and forceful—F. Brunetière says¹ ‘there is hardly anything in French superior to some of these Letters’—which increased in vehemence and bitterness as they appeared. It is generally acknowledged that they did an enormous amount of harm to the credit of the Jesuits, who replied, but very ineffectually, through Fathers Annat, Nouet, and Brisacier; in later years Father Daniel again replied to them, but by that time public opinion was hardly interested.

As to the distinction of fact and right, Pascal’s final sentiment seems to have been a repudiation of such an evasion; though in his earlier letters he appeared to approve the distinction. Sainte-Beuve says: ‘Pascal, throughout his whole life, only accomplished and wished to accomplish two things—to fight the Jesuits unto death in his *Provinciales*, and to ruin and demolish Montaigne in his *Pensées*.’² The latter work was published posthumously, in 1670, and to this day remains a classical monument to Pascal’s genius.

After the death of Pascal, in 1662, the next landmark is the attempt to break up the stronghold of Jansenism at Port-Royal-de-Paris and Port-Royal-des-Champs, in 1664. After a vain effort by Péréfixe, Archbishop of Paris, to win over the community to submission, twelve of the nuns from the former monastery were forcibly taken away and

¹ *Manual of the History of French Literature* (English trans., London, 1898), p. 165.

² *Port-Royal*, vol. ii. l. iii. n. 2, p. 388. The first edition of Montaigne’s *Essays* appeared in 1580.

placed in various other convents, where it was hoped they would soon come to their senses.¹ But in the following year it was decided to intern all the Port-Royal nuns from the convent at Paris in their monastery outside the city, and there they remained, to the number of about seventy, until 1669, guarded by troops and deprived of the Sacraments. Their refusal to sign the Archbishop's formulary against the Jansenistic distinction of fact and right was the immediate occasion of this severe measure, but the real reason was that it was found impossible to combat Jansenism effectually whilst these communities were left free to practise it.

The peace of Clement IX, inaugurated in 1668, gave Jansenism a new lease of life, but it was no longer the powerful party it had been, and were it not for the difficulties which Gallicanism created over the enforcement of Papal Bulls and the influence of the four Jansenist Bishops, Jansenism would have been long ago extinct.

The social influence, however, of Port-Royal was at its height during this period: amateur Jansenists from Paris loved to roll up in their carriages to be entertained by the 'Mothers of the Church.' But after the death of their great patroness, the Duchess de Longueville, in 1679, persecution of a lesser kind recommenced; pens were again taken up on either side. The exiled MM. de Port-Royal again poured forth their pamphlets and their opponents were not idle.

The headquarters of Jansenism in the last years of the seventeenth century were in the Low Countries, whither

¹The account of this incident, full of humour, may be read in Sainte-Beuve, l.c., vol. iv. l. v. n. 1-2. Gerberon gives (l.c., tom. iii. p. 84 seq.) the account of Péréfixe's visit, from the purely Jansenistic point of view, in which there is naught but tragedy—it would ill befit a Jansenist writer to perceive anything humorous in one of those situations which were the glory of Port-Royal. Sainte-Beuve, although strangely sympathetic with Jansenism, usually, confesses to a feeling of impatience at the shiftiness, airs of humility, and affected ignorance of the nuns, and smiles at the theatrical display of uncalled for heroism. It was not martyrdom to which they were summoned, but obedience. On the whole, however, it must be acknowledged that there is hardly anything more painful to read than the story of these deluded women, whose obstinacy in resisting their lawful superiors only non-Catholic minds can approve.

Arnauld and his companions had fled. The death of the author of *La Fréquente Communion*, in 1694, and of Nicole¹ in the following year, severed the last link binding latter-day Jansenism to the giants of former times. The leadership now fell to the Oratorian, Father Quesnel.

The famous *Case of Conscience* revived the whole controversy and the somewhat weary spirits of both parties in 1701-2; finally, if another Bull were yet wanting, there is that of 1705, the *Vineam Domini*, issued by Clement XI, which once more condemned the evasions of Jansenists regarding the Five Propositions. This time it was Louis XIV, now grown old and pious, who begged for such a Bull, in order to eradicate once and for all the pest of Jansenism.² But still the heresy lingers on: Port-Royal-des-Champs was abolished and suppressed in 1707, its buildings destroyed in 1710, and its cemetery removed in 1711. Quesnel, now the prophet of Jansenism, sees 101 propositions, taken from his *Moral Reflections on the New Testament*, condemned by the *Unigenitus* of 1713, though Cardinal de Noailles had approved an earlier edition of the work. Whereupon Noailles becomes recalcitrant, politics intervene, and the last years of Louis XIV close in a medley of theological, political, and social unrest. But the back of Jansenism is broken, its vigour and strength have departed³; St. Cyran and Jansenius would hardly have recognised in the Convulsionaries of St. Médard the austere religion they had founded a century previously. From the death of Louis XIV, in 1715, until Louis XV attains his majority the history of Jansenism is still interesting,⁴ but in the absence of a Port-Royal the movement lacks

¹ One of the most prolific of the Port-Royal writers, Nicole had followed Pascal's *Lettres* with others called *Les Imaginaires*. Lavissee gives 1693 and 1694 as the dates for the death of Arnauld and Nicole, respectively; this is surely a mistake. Cf. *Hist. de France*, vol. viii. (i.) p. 315; Paris, 1911.

² Lavissee, l.c., t. viii. (1), p. 328.

³ Nevertheless, the torrent of Jansenistic literature continued to flow right down to 1750; the dispersed nuns had now the strings of their tongues unloosed, and did not forego their privilege!

⁴ For some interesting documents concerning the later history of Jansenism, cf. L. Mention, *Documents relatifs aux Rapports du Clergé avec la Royauté*, tom. ii. Paris, 1903.

coherence, and becomes but a party cry. The indifferent onlooker, seeing in the confusion wrought by these religious quarrels a source of bewilderment, was only confirmed in his unbelief. The eighteenth century in France, and indeed elsewhere, was the century of unbelief, and so to Jansenius succeeds Voltaire; the *débâcle* is complete.

FR. ALFRED, O.S.F.C.

HEINRICH SUSO DENIFLE, O.P., HISTORIAN

BY PROFESSOR J. M. O'SULLIVAN, M.A., D.Ph.

JOSEPH DENIFLE was born in 1844 at Imst, a village pleasantly situated in the beautiful valley of the Inn, about thirty-five miles above Innsbruck. Despite the very frequent changes of residence which the business of his Order or his restless pursuit of knowledge entailed, and the almost international character which his work was to assume, he ever remained a typical son of the Catholic Tyrol, and more than one of his literary antagonists was to complain of the rough and blustering tone—smacking somewhat of his native mountains—which so often characterised his controversial writings. At eighteen he joined the Dominican Order at Graz and received his name in religion from the medieval mystic, Heinrich Suso. He was ordained priest in 1866 and three years later was sent to Rome, where he studied under the well-known scholastic philosopher, Zigliara. We find him again at Graz, in 1870, as teacher of philosophy. Now followed over thirty years of ceaseless intellectual activity, devoted especially to the exposition and defence of the theology, philosophy, and general outlook on life of the Catholic Middle Ages. He died at Munich on June 10, 1905, when on his way to Cambridge to receive the honorary degree which the University conferred upon him in recognition of his eminence as a historian. On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of his death it may not be out of place to call attention to the work of one who, with some justice, may claim to be acknowledged as the foremost Catholic historical investigator of recent years.

As teacher of philosophy and theology at Graz, he became thoroughly familiar with the writings of St. Thomas and Aristotle. To this early training may be traced his marked aversion to anything which savoured of loose thinking and of that empty phrase-making which in historiography, as elsewhere, so often does duty for accurate knowledge. A generation later we have the following characteristic declaration¹: 'When, as a young Dominican, I had gradually succeeded in scattering the clouds and myths in which Protestant historians had concealed the German mystics, the aged Friederick Zanke asked me where I had acquired my method. To his astonishment I answered that it was simply the Aristotelian-Scholastic method applied to history. Up to that time I was ignorant of any other. It was only later that I busied myself with modern methods.' Subsequently he went through a thorough training in palæography and in German philology. Palæography he mastered, both practically and theoretically, and he made full use of the opportunities with which his appointment as under-archivist of the Vatican and his frequent journeys to the principal European libraries provided him.

For him assertions, no matter how brilliant and 'philosophical,' which did not rest on a firm foundation of properly documented facts, were anathema. In the introduction to his splendid *History of the Origins of Medieval Universities* he clearly defines his position in this respect²:—

The method which I have adopted is the same as that which I followed in my investigations concerning the German mystics—the analytic. In a sphere where so much has still to be done and where the facts have still to be discovered, it seems to me that by means of the synthetic method we can have no hope of attaining unimpeachable results. There is a constant danger of substituting the universal for the particular, of basing our conclusions on faulty induction, or, conversely, of regarding phenomena which are of

¹ *Luther und Luthertum*, vol. i. 2nd ed., p. 853 n.

² Page xxiii.

general occurrence as exceptions, and finally of confusing different epochs. I strongly dislike arguments of this kind :—this condition of affairs was in existence in this place or in this century, therefore this other condition must prevail in some other place or in some other century. We do much better service to historical science when we take our stand on a foundation of facts and conquer and secure the ground step by step.

Denifle, indeed, was not only the tireless investigator, ever on the search for new material and ‘sources,’ but also the ruthless destroyer of many of those rubbish heaps collected by previous historians of the Middle Ages. Overhasty attempts at ‘masterly surveys’ had produced travesties of life and of doctrine, legends resting on no solid basis, but transmitted from one writer to another, and soon attaining the dignity of well-established history. For this ‘science’ Denifle had nothing but contempt. Examples he was to find in plenty. On more than one occasion, when he wished to trace the relation of some problem in which he was interested to some more general question, he was to find that, despite the existence of ‘histories’ dealing with the latter, the whole investigation had to be undertaken afresh. Thus it was that he was being continually driven from one field of inquiry to another. Masterly, scholarly, and thorough to an unusual degree were his labours in them all, but owing to this continual shifting of interest he was never able to complete any of his vast programmes. In many points he succeeded in modifying very materially the accepted views, and made most notable contributions to our knowledge of the Middle Ages. We have from his pen a number of works of first-class importance, as well as very many smaller treatises and collections of documents, which throw light on lesser problems.

His first noteworthy contributions were made in connexion with the German mystics, and in a few years he was *the* acknowledged master in this domain. The fearless myth-slayer already makes his appearance. Many accepted theories were shown to be false. His knowledge

of Scholasticism also stood him in good stead. Historians have always displayed a certain glibness in discussing the Scholastic system, which the extent of their knowledge by no means justifies. It was therefore, perhaps, not surprising that Denifle should succeed in upsetting some pet assumptions. He was able to trace the relation of Mysticism to Scholasticism, and to prove a friendship where an enmity had been assumed. The supposed anti-Catholic tendencies of the German mystics were relegated to the limbo of exploded theories. He was gradually beginning to realise that in the case of many theories concerning the Middle Ages it was a case of theory first, investigation afterwards.

Through his studies in the medieval mystics he was led to the project of tracing the struggle between the Mendicant Orders and the University of Paris. But he soon discovered that the previous work on the University of Paris, and on medieval Universities in general, was scientifically worthless. With his usual energy he set about making good the deficiency. The principal libraries of Europe revealed their documentary treasures to him. In 1885 appeared his *Foundation of the Universities of the Middle Ages up to 1400*. This was to be the first of five volumes dealing with the history of medieval Universities, but the scheme was never completed, and only this first, but probably most important, volume was published. The work was at once recognised by experts as a masterpiece of patient and painstaking investigation.¹ It immediately

¹ To quote only two. Mr. Rashdall, in the preface to his *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, speaks of Denifle as the only modern writer to whom on the whole he is under important obligations. 'The English Universities form the only part of the subject in which Father Denifle has left scope for much originality to his successors, so far at least as the all-important question of origins is concerned. . . . I feel it my duty to give expression to the admiration which a careful comparison of his book with the authorities upon which it is based has filled me, not merely for the immensity of his learning and for the thoroughness of his work, but for the general soundness of his conclusions.' Similarly Friederick Paulsen, the well-known authority on the history of German education, speaks highly of this 'most meritorious work.' Resting as it does on the 'sources,' it renders possible for the first time an insight into the development of the University system of Europe. Cf. the critique in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* for 1885.

supplanted all previous efforts, based as it was on profuse employment of records, many hitherto unpublished. Many of the theories of his predecessors were shown to owe more to the imaginations of their authors than to historical evidence. What he says of one writer might be made more general in its application: 'To a great extent the old errors are repeated, and new hypothesis adopted and put forward without the slightest hesitation; peculiarities yield generalisations.' 'More speculation than inquiry' is his verdict on another.

The establishment of the various Universities all over Europe affords striking proof of the advanced state of medieval civilisation and is a glowing testimony to the services rendered by the Church to the advancement of knowledge.

The History of the foundation of Universities may well be called a history of the efforts made by the better portions of the peoples to acquire new centres of civilisation. . . . The credit is due to the Popes, the secular rulers, the clergy, and the laity.¹ . . . But that the chief share must fall to the Popes everyone will admit who has followed the account, resting exclusively on documentary evidence, which I have given, and who reads history with unbiassed eyes. . . . None of the Popes were untrue to the behests of Nicholas IV, Boniface VIII, and Clement V, that learning should thrive, especially in those districts which were specially fitted for the expansion of science, and that the individual Christian lands should possess a sufficient number of men scientifically trained.²

Perhaps the most interesting recognition of the scientific value of Denifle's book was the action of the French Government in entrusting him—in conjunction with M. E. Chatelain—with the task of editing the records of the University of Paris. The four volumes of the *Chartularium*

¹ 'In this sphere we can discover a wonderful harmony between Church and State, between the secular and the spiritual forces, and that even at a time when we may talk of serious disagreement in other spheres.'—Denifle, *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, p. 794.

² Denifle, *op. cit.*, pp. 792 et seq. Cf. Paulsen, *l.c.* Events at Erfurt 'throw an unexpected light on the state of learning there before the foundation of the University, and the fact finds expression that the medieval Universities all turned their regards to the Papal Curia as towards the real centre of their world.'

Universitatis Parisiensis and the two volumes of the *Auctarium Chartularii* form a collection of documents of great value for the history, not only of the University, but of Scholasticism and medieval civilisation in general. Well do they merit the epithet 'magnificent,' with which, on more than one occasion, Mr. Rashdall describes them.

In collecting material for this work our author had to examine a huge mass of records, especially in the Vatican Library, and the truth gradually dawned upon him that he had before him most valuable first-hand evidence of the desolation which the Hundred Years' War brought on the churches, monasteries, and hospitals of France. With his accustomed energy he threw himself into this new task. The labour he expended in getting together not only the unpublished matter but also the scattered monographs dealing with the French provincial history of this period has been justly described as enormous. In 1897 and 1899 three volumes appeared, which are at once a thesaurus of documents, a vivid picture of the disasters of the Church, and the first really connected exposition of what the War meant to the length and breadth of France. The full extent of the disasters accompanying the War, and of the ruin caused by the depredation of the freebooters was now revealed for the first time. Murder and rapine were rife all through France, and it is difficult to say whether the unfortunate people suffered more from their friends or from their foes. The churches and monasteries were especial sufferers. Their properties were ravaged, their buildings destroyed, and their revenues reduced, often almost to vanishing point. But worse than the material, was the moral damage. Forced to fight for their property and their lives, the monks often adopted the freer life of the military profession. And among those who remained within the walls of their monasteries discipline was frequently almost as good as non-existent. Even a cursory glance through the select bibliographies given for each chapter of Volume IV of the standard *History of France*, edited by M. Lavissee, will convince the reader of the value

of Denifle's contributions to the history of the Hundred Years' War.

These investigations led him to the composition of his last and most famous book, *Luther und Luthertum*.

For years, in addition to my work on the University of Paris and the desolation of the churches of France during the Hundred Years' War, it was one of my further occupations to provide a collection of sources for the study of the deterioration of the secular and regular clergy in the fifteenth century. As in the case of all my other investigations, nothing was further from my thoughts than Luther and Lutheranism. My interest lay solely, and with full impartiality, in the study of the two divergent streams which, at any rate in France and Germany, were noticeable since the end of the fourteenth century: that of deterioration and corruption among a great portion of the secular and regular clergy, and that of moral regeneration and recovery among another portion. But it was especially the former stream that engaged my attention.¹

In the case of numbers of the clergy matters continued to grow steadily worse, and the commandment *non concupisces* was more and more disregarded *in practice*. In the first two decades of the sixteenth century the condition of affairs was exceedingly bad. But the worst was not yet come, vows were not as yet violated *on principle*. A short time afterwards this step had been taken, and the 'gospel of the flesh,' in the shape of clerical marriage and rejection of vows, was being openly preached. Now, in the midst of this movement, the giant figure of Luther towered above all others. He had to be dealt with if the problem were to be satisfactorily treated. Thus Denifle set himself the task of tracing the development of Luther's views and character, in order to grasp how and when it was that he fell away from the Church and her teaching and became the leader of this movement.²

The sensation which followed the appearance of the book was immense. Yet it must be acknowledged that for this the undoubted merits of the work were not wholly responsible. In fact an appreciation is not here so simple

¹ *Luther und Luthertum*, p. 1.

² *Op. cit.*, Introduction.

or easy as in the case of Denifle's other big works. For this reason, and owing to its unmistakable importance, a somewhat more detailed consideration may be permitted.

Many misconceptions might have been avoided if critics had borne in mind that Denifle's book neither was, nor was intended to be, a biography of the 'Reformer.' Indeed, one of his main contentions was—that, in the prevailing state of ignorance concerning Luther and his environment, nothing in the nature of a scientific biography can be even attempted. In this contention there is undoubtedly much truth. The various 'lives' may be fairly accused of failing to give us a correct picture of the concrete Luther of the sixteenth century, and of providing us instead, each after its manner, with something in the nature of a dummy figure, on which the different Protestant sects of to-day may each hang its religious ideals.

It may be well to call attention to the principal objects which Denifle had in view when writing his *Luther und Luthertum*. As we gather from the Introduction, his main purpose was to understand the development and character of Luther, in reference to that movement of clerical deterioration in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries which had previously been occupying his attention. He will not consider Luther in the abstract, but restored as it were to the context of his times. He will understand him in reference to that concrete body of doctrine out of which and in opposition to which he developed. He will discover the time and the reasons of his revolt and his subsequent attitude towards that teaching of the Church which he rejected. But the book is also meant as a clear and definite challenge to the Protestant biographers of Luther and historians of the Reformation. That portion of the German 'scientific' and 'objective' school of history which deals with Luther and the Reformation is accused of being guilty of such unscientific procedure as would be tolerated in no other science and in no other branch of history.

We thus see that the controversial purpose was quite

as strong as the purely historical. Catholic doctrine is expounded and defended and protected against the falsifications to which it was subjected at the hands of Luther and his followers. But, despite the sharp and harsh tone that pervades the whole book, it was meant as a controversial challenge on strictly scientific terms. Thus every appeal to the mob and questions and debates in the Prussian Parliament are quite beside the points at issue. And an attempt, like that of Seeberg,¹ to make the existence of religious peace of Germany depend on the acceptance or rejection by Catholics of Denifle's book, brings us on to an entirely different plane.

But even when we take into account and make allowance for his controversial purpose and the limited scope of his inquiry, it must still be acknowledged that Denifle's work on Luther has some very obvious defects. His tone when dealing with Luther is uniformly very harsh, and when dealing with contemporary Luther-specialists becomes, at times, rude and insulting. His attack would not have lost anything in strength and, from the controversial standpoint, might have gained in effectiveness, if it had been characterised by more politeness and calm. At any rate his opponents would have been deprived of what has proved a very useful weapon of attack and would have been compelled to address themselves more seriously and definitely to the very important issues raised.

But the excessive vigour and rudeness of Denifle's language is at least capable of *explanation*. It is not by any means all due to his native ruggedness. His state of health ought not to be entirely lost sight of; for during the last two or three years of his life it was far from satisfactory.² Also, perhaps, an opponent who had to do so much with Luther—a past-master in bad language and terms of abuse—may be partially excused, if at times, his ardour overcomes him and he hits back with vigour.

¹ *Luther und Luthertum in der neuesten Katholischen Beleuchtung*, Prof. Seeberg, Professor of Theology in Berlin University, p. 5.

² Cf. Weis, *Lutherpsychologie*, p. 66.

Let us, furthermore, not forget that the preliminary studies for this work¹—dealing with the decline of religious life in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—were undertaken at a period when a bitter attack was being made on the Church and her existence. Whether Catholics made the slightest attempt to defend themselves, or meekly accepted the position of whipping-boys, they were vigorously denounced as disturbers of religious harmony and peace. To Denifle the controversial methods used to misrepresent and abuse the Church and to turn the readers against her seemed in no essential to differ from those employed by Luther against the sixteenth-century Papacy. In both periods he saw the fierce aggressor complain that he was not left in peace, he saw flagrant prejudice masquerade under the mask of absolute impartiality. Was he not weary of hearing that Science and Objectivity are Protestant?² Yet this Objectivity seemed to mean not only the acceptance of the Protestant account of historical facts but also of the dogmatic value which was to be assigned to them. He was profoundly irritated against that conception of history which permitted, nay encouraged, disbelief in the divinity and existence of the Founder of Christianity, but forbade any attempt to deal seriously with the doctrines and character of Luther.³ Nor must it be forgotten that those very critics, who were so loud in their denunciations of Denifle and ‘his vulgar abuse’ of Luther and Protestantism, at times had seemed strangely unaware that Catholics might have similar susceptibilities. Even in the pamphlets in which they make their complaints this ‘subjectivity’ on their part is very apparent, and their language is not always characterised by saintly moderation. We regret that Denifle lost control over his tongue and gave bitter expression to his opinion of Luther and to his contempt for time-honoured ignorance, passing for knowledge, of Catholic doctrines and practices;

¹ Cf. Denifle, *Luther und Luthertum*, 1st ed., pp. v. et seq.

² Ibid. 1st ed., pp. 828 et seq., especially the passage quoted from Max Lenz.

³ Ibid. 1st ed., p. vii.; 2nd ed., pp. iii. iv.

but we cannot regard the occurrence as altogether inexplicable.

But the book seems to suffer from a more serious defect than the bitterness of tone. That, in a volume of over eight hundred pages, there should be occasional slips, and even one or two real errors and serious misinterpretations of Luther's meaning, is only what was to be expected, especially when we consider the almost entirely new road along which Denifle was travelling. But, apart from these practically unavoidable blots, I think that his picture of Luther, as a whole, may not unreasonably be accused of one-sidedness. He seems to forget that maxim which he quoted with approval in the preface to his *History of Universities*, 'qui nimis probat nihil probat.' Luther is too uniformly painted in the darkest colours. There are plenty of passages in Luther's writings which speak trumpet-tongued against himself, but our author can be accused more than once of straining and misinterpreting his texts. Texts whose meaning is doubtful are never understood in a light favourable to Luther. Just as on the other side the apologists of the Reformation, in order to give an innocent complexion to texts damning to their hero, seem more bent on straining after the most far-fetched exegesis than on striving to grasp what the actual meaning must be. Denifle is also inclined to take too seriously some of Luther's jests—which, indeed, are often in the worst taste—and to use them as convincing evidence against their author's moral character. He is, furthermore, too ready to denounce as a downright lie what is probably only the malicious misunderstanding due to vehement bias and party-spirit. Even if Luther flagrantly misrepresents doctrines and reproduces corrupt texts, of which there is evidence that at an early period he knew the correct meaning and form, it is hardly just to accuse him of wilful forgery and lying. Memory plays us strange tricks, and the very passion which Luther threw into his revolt did not serve to make his less defective or less under the influence of the interests of his polemics. Indeed,

as the struggle went on, Luther seems to have become more and more incapable of seeing things objectively. All of which goes, it is true, to strengthen the very sharp and just criticism which Denifle passes on those biographers who uncritically accept Luther's statement of Catholic doctrine and the accounts which, late in life, he gave of his earlier development. But even if he were as dishonest as Denifle makes out in the choice of weapons and means to his end, it need not necessarily follow that in his main purpose he was not sincere. Politicians have not a proverbial reputation for honesty or consistency, yet some are sincere; and, in some respects at all events, Luther was a man of action and a politician.

I think it is clear that, with whatever impartiality Denifle may have approached his subject, he finally lost his temper with a man whom he constantly saw violating and outraging important principles, misrepresenting and most vilely abusing sacred institutions, acting not only in conflict with his own earlier convictions but apparently also with those which he was at that very moment professing, preaching freedom and claiming what looked like infallible authority, with love on his lips but with hatred in his actions. Then, also, the context in reference to which Denifle tried to understand Luther—the degeneration of the sixteenth-century clergy—was really too narrow. Luther has a significance that reaches beyond this movement, and was something more than a renegade monk; and in so far as he was something more Denifle's portrait of him is inadequate. Yet it must be borne in mind that it is at least a portion of the picture, and that the context, in reference to which many Protestant historians wish to interpret Luther, namely, their own religious ideals, which they may genetically trace back to him, is still less historically correct and adequate. Whether, when all allowances have been made, his action and speech were such as are compatible with the position claimed for him as a religious reformer is a question which belongs rather to dogmatic theology than to history.

These are in general the main objections which may, with any fairness, be made against Denifle's *Luther und Luthertum*. It remains, as briefly as possible, to direct attention to some of its really brilliant qualities. The first edition contained twenty-six pages of text-criticism of the early volumes of the critical edition of Luther's works, which Denifle's exceptional and profound knowledge of the Fathers, especially St. Augustine, of the Scholastics, and of the Mystics, enabled him to contribute. All these criticisms are not of equal importance, nor are all his sharp strictures on Protestant scholars equally merited. It is not fair to expect these latter to be as familiar with Catholic prayers as was the learned Dominican. Nor is it surprising that they should not be as well grounded in Scholastic terminology, though they would have avoided grave errors, even in reference to Luther, if they had been. But it was certainly no credit to their science that they should wait for this Dominican, who began to busy himself with Luther at the very end of his life, to point out that the 'Lectures on Judges' was spurious, and consisted almost entirely of extracts from different works of St. Augustine. On the whole he proves the edition to be from the point of view of scholarship more or less of a scandal. Some of the principal editors gratefully accepted Denifle's suggestions and the section was consequently omitted from the second edition of *Luther und Luthertum*.

But to the history of Luther he made such more important contributions than this. He put the problem of the birth and development of the revolt on an entirely new footing. Here again his knowledge of previous theological writings was of immense assistance. Never before had an author appeared who devoted so much attention to the study of Luther, and was at the same time so deeply read in that Scholasticism which, after all, was Luther's starting-point. Without such knowledge it had been impossible to fix the point at which he broke away from the Church. Ignorance of Catholic doctrines had tempted some to put it too early, recognising as 'typically Lutheran' what a

deeper knowledge would have convinced them was perfectly orthodox. The uncritical acceptance of Luther's later statements about his earlier career tended still further to lead his biographers astray. Denifle can claim at least to have made a beginning of doing for Luther what De Tocqueville succeeded in doing for the French Revolution. He laid the foundations for the attempt to trace the connexion between the revolt and those orthodox views which were rejected.¹ Until the task is fully accomplished a satisfactory biography is out of the question.²

But perhaps the most valuable side of the work is to be found in those portions devoted to the detection and refutation of the falsifications of Catholic teaching of which Luther was guilty, and which his followers have ever since so blindly accepted, until, by mere repetition, they seemed to acquire the force of historical truth. Among the numerous subjects dealt with we may mention various errors connected with monasticism and the monastic vows, especially that of chastity, with asceticism and its place, meaning, and significance in Catholic teaching and practice, with the Catholic ideal of life. Even more important, perhaps, is the demonstration against Luther of the place of Christ in the Catholic doctrine and worship of the Middle Ages. Luther is proved to have completely misunderstood the Augustinian doctrine of sin. He is also guilty of very serious calumnies on the Church's attitude towards marriage and women. In what is really a masterly piece of exegesis and research Denifle—appealing to a number of passages which he shows Luther to have known—proves the falsity of the famous statement that the Church always represented the Almighty as the stern judge. By citations from the breviaries and missals of Luther's own Order, he shows that, on the contrary, the Church represented the

¹ Cf. W. Braun, *Die Concupiscenz bei Luther*: 'It is only when we have fully mastered the terminology, methods, and different schools of medieval theology that we can come to conclusions and be in a position to understand Luther's development. In this respect Denifle's *Luther und Luthertum* was a wholesome if painful lesson for [us] Protestant theologians' (pp. v. vi.)

² Ibid. Denifle was also the first to make full use of the *Commentary on Romans* for determining the starting-point of the revolt.

Lord always as the merciful and gracious God. And he shows that, so far from it being true that all Catholic theologians before Luther had taken the *justitia Dei* in Romans i. 17 in the sense of divine anger and vengeance, no one had so taken it. In a separate volume he gives the views of sixty-six commentators—including not only the principal doctors of the Church, but also Luther himself at an earlier date and many hitherto unknown authors, extracts from whose writings are now published for the first time. Not one of them—and they include all that Luther can have known as well as many others besides—justifies Luther's statement. It must be acknowledged that such a thorough refutation has seldom appeared¹; it ought to deal its death-blow to one of the most famous legends about the Catholic teaching of the Middle Ages.

Despite all that has been said against it, Denifle's *Luther und Luthertum* is probably the most serious contribution to the biography of the 'Reformer' which has been made in recent times. Yet perhaps it emphasizes a certain characteristic of Denifle's work which some of his friends have insisted on; he was more pre-eminent as an *investigator* than as a *writer* of history. His knowledge and control of 'sources' were truly astounding, and enabled him in the long course of his literary activity to slay many a tough-lived legend. But, in addition to his immense learning, he had one other outstanding quality essential to the historian, he had an intense dislike of shibboleths, and ever possessed a sincere and profound love of the truth. Well did he merit Pastor's eulogy that he was one of those very few men who were never guilty of falsehood.

J. M. O'SULLIVAN.

¹ Cf. Walter Köhler—a well-known Protestant Luther-expert, who, like many others, was indignant at the tone of Denifle's *Luther*—in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, November 10, 1906: 'Human sentiment as well as science was gratified by the fact that, immediately before his death, he was able to complete a portion of his Luther-work, which, as a piece of learning, is superior to the rest. His series of medieval interpretations of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans i. 17, is a still further proof of the Dominican's stupendous knowledge and restless spirit of inquiry. . . . An exceedingly valuable contribution to the history of Paulism, the source of Luther's theology.' He also points out that Denifle's work on Luther, as a whole, has raised problems which will busy historical investigation for many years to come.

NOTES ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

By JOHN HOWLEY, M.A.

III

VARIETIES OF MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE

WE have seen that mystical experience is the reaction to the impress of the negative idea of God on the purified will. Its tone is essentially affective but with a cognitive feature apprehended in and by the affection. There is a fusion of cognition and affection in one act; their union is, as it were, substantial. It is a loving knowledge or rather a love that knows. The *verbum mentis*, the expressed word of the mind in mystical experience, is not the formulation of the intellect, but the utterance of the whole inner mind, intelligence, and will in one. If it were but the expression of intelligence we would have some concomitant image, whereas the absence of images, or their irrelevance when present, is a note of mystical experience on which all the descriptive mystics are agreed. The theorists object and invent systems of infused ideas or abstractions from sense data so directly apprehended, with such complete absence of psychic reflection, that they are unnoticed and impress the will unobserved. It is a systematic necessity which our theory avoids. These invisible, fully-formed cognitions, unobserved by the descriptive mystics, can only be acceptable when shown to be philosophically necessary. The operations of our middle psychic selves, the normal processes of understanding and will, are much more simple and unified than the work of the senses, imagination and instincts, which make up our outer selves. Is it unreasonable

to suppose that the operations of the inmost self are still more simple and unified? Mystical experience is something beyond a meditation reduced to a point.

The absence of images from mystical experience has been hotly contested by many theorists, but is a commonplace with the descriptive mystics. Père Poulain regards this absence of images as one of the characteristics of the mystical state and declares: 'When philosophers study the functions of the human mind in its natural state, they justly have recourse to observation. Let them suffer the students of mysticism to act similarly in regard to a supernatural state.'¹ It is a matter of observable fact, and the testimony of contemplatives as to the psychic character of their experiences should be accepted. It is true that images have been perceived, but they are not related to the state itself, and are in the nature of distractions, or 'additional acts,' as Père Poulain has so aptly styled those psychic phenomena superadded to the central mystical experience.²

But is there nothing in the way of an image to be found as part of a mystical experience? Is the spatial element wholly eliminated? Is there not more than a hint of a spatial image in the following, from the life of St. Alphonsus Rodriguez: 'The bodily eyes see what is in front of them, not what is behind; but the eyes of the soul, which is a spirit, see not only what is before, but behind, on right and left. Thus the soul which is enclosed in God, enjoys, sees, and knows Him on all sides by means of that keen light which God gives it to see Him and relish Him.'³ This sense of space is an accompaniment of mystical experience, but it is in the nature of a psychic supplement. It has no relation to the experience itself which is not localised by the imagination. It is as if the imagination, fatigued by the void, created a minimum of representation to accompany the experience. Often there is a sense of light, sometimes of heat, as if the lower powers

¹ Poulain, *Les Graces d'Oraison*, 5th ed., p. 119.

² Ibid. p. 123.

³ Quoted Poulain, op. cit., footnote, p. 228.

were tired of standing idle and sought to contribute their quota to the whole experience.¹ The effects of this co-operation by the lower self are sometimes very striking. Contemplatives, at the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, have felt as if they were before a great and gentle furnace; the impression was more than imaginary or merely mental, it showed itself in a copious perspiration. A sense of light, generally feeble, but quite distinct from that which filters through the closed eyelids, is fairly common. It comes and goes suddenly with the crisis of the experience, varying in intensity with it.

Generally the action of mystical experience on the lower self is inhibitory. Even where the imagination is blank and the emotions stilled the senses are active to outside stimulation, but their activity is distinctly lowered when the mystical action is strong. Perhaps one of the most important of Père Poulain's contributions to the study of mysticism is his account of the various modes in which quite moderate mystical states, like the prayer of quiet, lower the sensibility.² There is a fog before the eyes, etc. These phenomena, trivial in themselves, are of importance in showing that during mystical experience there is an extraordinary concentration of vital energy. In ecstasy this is manifest enough, the body seems lifeless very often, but a similar withdrawal of vital force in lower mystical stages, very slight of course in comparison, had not been sufficiently observed prior to Père Poulain's great work. His theory that the prayer of quiet is a diminutive of the state of ecstasy has been sharply criticised by the Abbé Saudreau,³ who has not observed these phenomena of lowered external sensibility. Doubtless it is a matter of psychic temperament in the subjects under observation; some would be more affected than others. But the phenomenon is one that we might naturally expect, for a state of profound attention, even in normal psychic life, lowers

¹ Cf. Poulain, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

² *Ibid.* p. 165.

³ *Les Faits Extraordinaires de la Vie Spirituelle* (Paris: Vic et Amat, 1908, p. 200).

the sensibility. The matter will have its importance when we come to consider the 'ligature.'

These effects go to show the extreme dynamism of the negative idea of God, which can so energise the will as to affect the whole man, even in his outer senses. Yet the idea itself is so abstract as to defy formulation by the intelligence. It is a Beyond of consciousness which the metaphysician cannot reach, save remotely by way of negation, and yet the conscious results of its impress on the will are startling even to the very senses. It comes suddenly, not as the ultimate of a process of abstraction, but as an agent seen in its effects. Is it infused by grace, or does grace enable the mystic to abstract it from the given of sense and of faith as it were by an intuitive glance? The latter would seem the preferable view, as it retains mystical experience exclusively in the order of faith. The special action of grace would be what the theologian ascribes to the *donum intellectus*, and above all to the *donum sapientiae*. But the mode in which the negative idea is formed is beyond the purview of the psychologist; all he can know is that its origin is not the result of a process of conscious abstraction. The psychic kenosis of the field of consciousness merely clears away obstacles, it does not create the experience. That process of recollection which is essential to mystical experience does not seem to the subject at all akin psychologically to the philosophical abstraction by process of negation. It is a seeking to find something that is there, but invisible, by concentrating the attention and disregarding the normally visible, a peering into the shadows, rather than the attempt to filter out the invisible residue from the normally visible of which it forms part. Take the analogy of a photographic negative. If we hold it up against the light we see the picture, but with light and shade reversed, very clear and distinct. Unless we take a print from the negative we can but dimly guess at what the original is like. We can see the outlines and details sharply, but it would require a rare gift of visual abstraction to mentally reverse the scheme of light and

shade. But if we place the negative on a piece of black velvet, and view it by reflected light at a certain angle, we can see it clearly, but very faintly, as a positive. The analogy is crude, like all physical analogies to psychic processes, but it illustrates how an image may be at once a negative and a positive, according to the mode of vision. As we see the positive in the negative by obscuring the negative as such, so we reach the negative idea with the will, by shutting out from consciousness the normally positive elements. The negative idea is there all the time, but obscured by what is more evident.

The action of grace does not merely consist in enabling the soul to find this negative idea, but to apperceive it with the will. As St. Bonaventure declares: 'The gift of wisdom, in the stricter sense, signifying the experimental knowledge of God, has its chief act which consists in affection.'¹ The reaction of the will in love is the most conscious feature of mystical experience. Cognition of a sort is a later development and resultant of affection. The will is conscious that it seized and held as no reflection of created things can hold it. There is an immediate inference as to cause, so immediate as to appear intuitive. The act is not a syllogism, an argument, but rather akin to the animal instinct, in its immediate leap from particular to particular. The lamb fears the first wolf he sees; the inmost self, touched by God, knows the Master's touch. Père Poulain rejects the notion of inference and insists on intuition²; but apart from the grave theological objections to his view of mystical experience as an intuition, an attenuation as it were of the Beatific Vision, his theory does not save the phenomena in certain cases, such as the Night of the Spirit, recognised by all authorities as unquestionably mystical.

¹ 'Donum sapientiae, prout pressius sumitur, significans Dei experimentalem cognitionem, habet actum praecipuum in affectione consistentem.'—Conclusio Dist. xxxv. a. 1, q. 1.

² *Les Graces d'Oraison*, 5th ed., p. 68. For the fuller criticism of Père Poulain's theory, see Saudreau, *Les Faits Extraordinaires de la Vie Spirituelle*, chap. iv.; and Delacroix, *Ascétique et Mystique* (Paris: Bloud, pp. 44 et seq.).

He considers that the real difference between mystical experience and the recollection of ordinary prayer is that in the mystical state God is no longer satisfied with helping us to *think* of Him and to *remember* His presence, but He gives us an experimental intellectual knowledge of this presence. . . . There is a profound difference between *thinking* of a person, and *feeling* him near one. When we thus feel someone near us, we may say we have an experimental knowledge of his presence. In ordinary prayer, one has only an abstract knowledge of the presence of God.¹

Hence he contends for a perception of God in mystical experience analogous to our sense perception of objects in normal experience. From this comes his famous discriminant of the mystical state, *the presence of God felt*. He admits that in the lower mystical states this felt presence is very obscure and hardly perceived; but he insists on its being the psychological essence of mystical experience, for, in answer to those who would define it as a union with God by love, he urges—

We must add that this love is provoked by a known experimental possession of God. That is where it differs from the love one has in the ordinary way of prayer. By itself the Divine love does not make God known as present in the soul. You would have quite similar feelings for absent friends. You are joined in memory and heart with them; but that is very different from a grasp of the hand.²

The descriptions of their experience by the mystics go to show that there is in mystical contemplation a very real sense of the presence of God, more substantial, so to speak, than in ordinary prayer, but is it the spiritual sensation, the direct perception, Père Poulain contends? The texts he cites will bear another interpretation, as Saudreau and others have shown. Is the psychic factor of love to be neglected in this '*perception*'? Has not Père Poulain concentrated too much on the cognitive element in the '*sense*' of presence and overlooked the affective factor?

Our '*sense*' of another's presence is largely affected by

¹ Poulain, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

² *Ibid.* p. 67.

our feelings in regard to him. A devout Catholic kneeling at Mass is hardly disturbed by another person coming into the bench, if that person is a total stranger. But if he is an old friend, not seen for many years, or someone personally disliked, the distraction is very vehement, and the recovery of recollection a difficult task. Surely the *presence* in the two instances is very different? The cognition of physical presence is the same, but its apperception by the will varies and reacts vehemently on the sensible cognition and on the whole field of consciousness. The tone value of the sense experience is altered, the given of sense remain the same, but they are received into a different affective consciousness. Are we not acutely conscious of the presence of what we vehemently dislike, can we not almost see it in the dark?

The putting oneself in the presence of God of ordinary prayer and meditation is too often, alas! but a pitiful formalism, of but small psychic value. Even where this act of faith is made devoutly and from the heart, it is the expression of an intellectual assent to a dogmatic truth rather than a cordial realisation of a fact. The notion of the presence of God is but one element in the field of consciousness among a vast crowd of others whose dynamism is greater as they come closer to our senses. The idea of God, so abstract and above our power to grasp with a sense of reality, must needs remain a feeble element in consciousness, however much we strive to reinforce it. We know that He is present, yet we must ever cry, 'I believe; Lord, help my unbelief.' Is it strange, then, that the sense of presence is feeble, even in fervent ordinary prayer?

But the idea of God comes into mystical experience very differently, as we have seen. It is no longer a feebly dynamic element coming into a crowd. It comes to its own place in the apex of the mind and with its own immense dynamism. The will reacts, not feebly and perfunctorily, as to a shadow, but with a quite extraordinary vigour of love. The simple act of faith in God's presence

becomes the cordial realisation of a fact. The presence of God is felt because His presence acknowledged by faith is *realised* in love. It is a 'sense' of God here and now, an instinct of the Divine, but it does not cease to be a simple act of faith, *fidei formatissimae*. 'Quia actus appetitivae virtutis est quaedam inclinatio ad rem ipsam, secundum quamdam similitudinem, ipsa applicatio appetitivae virtutis ad rem, secundum quod ei inhaeret, accipit nomen *sensus*, quasi experientiam quamdam sumens de re, cui inhaeret, inquantum complacet sibi in ea.'¹ Thus St. Thomas seems to recognise a 'sense' as proceeding from the affective powers, which gives an experimental knowledge.

In the question of the 'ligature,' that group of psychic inhibitions caused by mystical experience, there is also a disagreement between Père Poulain and the Abbé Saudreau. The former asserts, the latter denies, that it is present in states lower than ecstasy.² Bossuet brought the term into fashion in his *Instruction sur les états d'oraison*, when discussing the characteristics of the passive state according to approved mystics.

The passive state is a state of suspension and ligature of the intellectual powers or faculties, in which the soul remains powerless to produce discursive acts. Attention must be given to this last phrase, for the intention of these doctors is not to exclude free acts from their prayer . . . which could be made without discourse, but acts where one excites oneself by a discourse or preceding reflection. . . . And here is a great change in the way of the soul's operations. For the soul, accustomed to reason and to arouse its affections by the consideration of certain motives, suddenly, as if impelled by a mighty hand, not alone ceases to discourse, but no longer is able to discourse; and this causes other inabilities during the period of prayer.³

Bossuet, as usual, exaggerates. The ligature does not cause a total impotence, only a difficulty, greater or less, as the case may be. Often it is a mere disinclination, an

¹ *Summa*, Ia. IIae. Q. 15 a.l.c.

² Cf. Saudreau, *Les Faits Extraordinaires*, chap. vi. section 2, p. 199.

³ Bossuet, *Instr. sur les états d'oraison*, l. vii. No. 9, quoted Poulain, p. 194.

absence of the *velle*, not the *posse*. Only in cases of ecstasy is there total inhibition.

A withdrawal of the lower powers from use occurs in rapture, because there is then no employment for them; but usually, in divine contemplation, there is no withdrawal of the faculties from use, for they continue usable to some extent, but only from full activity, because the soul pays no heed to their operation and their action is weakened, for when the action of one power grows more intense, that of another is weakened, as Aristotle declares.¹

We have similar inhibitions in normal psychic action; severe pain paralyses our mental powers.

Since all the powers of the soul are rooted in the one essence of the soul it necessarily follows that, when the intention of the soul is vehemently drawn to the operation of any one power, it is withdrawn from the operation of another; for each one soul can have but one intention, and on account of this, if anything attracts to itself the whole intention of the soul, or a great part of it, it will not suffer anything else besides which requires great attention.²

St. Thomas goes on to show how pain will absorb all attention and not suffer one to acquire new knowledge, or even reflect on what we know, if very severe. Hence, mystical experience which absorbs the attention of the whole soul, must necessarily lower the intensity of consciousness in all that does not concern it. Far from being extraordinary the ligature is what we might naturally expect to find from the ordinary principles which explain psychic activity. Its extent, of course, depends on the intensity with which the attention is held fixed. In very light cases of the prayer of quiet it might hardly be noticed and, of course, temperament plays a great part; hence come in all probability the doubts of the Abbé Saudreau. Those in whom the mystical experience is at all intense seldom fail to notice a strange and unwonted difficulty in reciting vocal prayers requiring any considerable degree of attention. Short, easily memorised, prayers, may be repeated without difficulty, or longer prayers read where the

¹ B. Alberti Magni, *Comm. in lib. de Myst. Theol. Dion.* c. I. No. 6 B, Dub. I. ad 1, quoted Meynard, footnote, p. 13.

² *Summa Theologica D. Thomae*, Ia. IIae. Q. 37, a. 1.c.

attention given is general; but when the mind tries to follow the meaning of the vocal prayer, or to indulge in reflections and considerations of its own, there is a sense of oblivion, of stupidity, of actual inhibition which is both striking and disconcerting to the inexperienced. The attention is elsewhere and better engaged, though the soul may not perceive it at first. If the soul were conscious of its own attention, it would not be surprised at the phenomena of the ligature; they would seem quite ordinary and to be expected as a matter of course.

St. John of the Cross makes use of the phenomena of the ligature, inability to meditate in the accustomed way, joined to a growing 'sense' of the presence of God, as the index of the soul's entrance on mystical experience.¹ Inability to meditate may proceed from some neurose or morbid psychose; the hysterical, the psychasthenic, the melancholic may be unable to construct their meditation as usual, they may experience a ligature, but their morbid state is sufficient to account for it. Or it may proceed from moral and spiritual slackness, from that *accidie* which the late Bishop of Oxford has so well described,² from the deadly sin of sloth. Hence the necessity to verify the absence of disease, physical or spiritual, before assigning mystical experience as the cause of the inability to meditate. In his directions, St. John of the Cross gives three tests:—

The first is this: when we find no comfort in the things of God, and none also in created things. For when God brings the soul into the dark night in order to wean it from sweetness and to purge the desire of sense, He does not allow it to find sweetness or comfort anywhere. It is then probable, in such a case, that this dryness is not the result of sins or imperfections recently committed; for if it were, we should feel some inclination or desire for other things than those of God. Whenever we give the reins to our desires in the way of any imperfection, our desires are instantly attracted to it, much or little, in proportion to the affection for it.

¹ *Ascent of Carmel*, Bk. II, chap. 13 et seq.; *Dark Night*, Bk. I, chap. 9.

² Paget, *The Sorrow of the World* (Longmans, 1912).

But still, inasmuch as this absence of pleasure in the things of heaven and of earth may proceed from bodily indisposition or a melancholy temperament, which frequently causes dissatisfaction with all things, the second test and condition become necessary.

The second test and condition of this purgation are that the memory dwells ordinarily upon God with a painful anxiety and carefulness, the soul thinks it is not serving God, but going backwards, because it is no longer conscious of any sweetness in the things of God. In that case it is clear that this weariness of spirit and aridity are not the results of weakness and lukewarmness; for the peculiarity of lukewarmness is the want of earnestness in, and of interior solicitude for, the things of God. There is, therefore, a great difference between dryness and lukewarmness, for the latter consists in great remissness and weakness of will and spirit, in the want of all solicitude about serving God. The true purgative aridity is accompanied in general by a painful anxiety, because the soul thinks that it is not serving God.¹

The third sign we have for ascertaining whether this dryness be the purgation of sense, is inability to meditate and make reflections, and to excite the imagination, as before, notwithstanding all the efforts we may make; for God begins now to communicate Himself, no longer through the channel of sense, as formerly, in consecutive reflections, by which we arranged and divided our knowledge, but in pure spirit, which admits not of successive reflections, and in the act of pure contemplation, to which neither the interior nor the exterior senses of our lower nature can ascend. Hence it is that the fancy and the imagination cannot help or suggest any reflections, nor use them ever afterwards.

It is understood here that this embarrassment and dissatisfaction of the senses do not arise out of any bodily ailment. When they arise from this, the indisposition, which is always changeable, having ceased, the powers of the soul recover their former energies, and find their previous satisfactions at once. It is otherwise in the purgation of the appetite, for as soon as we enter upon this, the inability to make our meditations continually grows.²

Expressed in terms of the theory we have suggested, this psychic process, the Dark Night of Sense, would take this form. The negative idea of God is impressed on the, as yet, unpurified will. On account of its impurities, its attachment to self and to created things, the will cannot

¹ *Dark Night* (Baker, p. 34).

² *Ibid.*, p. 39.

react to the impress with that love which gives the 'sense' of presence, but it is disturbed, and vehemently. There is conflict between the affective absorption in the negative idea and the attachments to the positive manifold of consciousness. When the attraction of the negative idea prevails psychic energy is withdrawn from the normal field and concentrated in the apex. Hence the weakening of the normal elements of consciousness and the gradual disintegration of the field during the period of action of the negative idea on the will. The will is withdrawn from what it formerly loved and esteemed, but nature is reluctant and the concentration of vital energy is painful and wearisome. With the gradual withdrawal of the will from the created it becomes more apt to respond to the impress of the negative idea, and hence comes the growing 'sense' of the presence of God. The very process of mystical experience in its inchoate stage is a purgation before it becomes an illumination. In the more terrible Dark Night of the Spirit the illumination itself becomes the purgation.

This second purgation, which falls to the lot of but few, is much more severe than the first. Those who have passed through the first night, the night of sense, have had their wills purified from attachment to the things of sense. 'The stains of the old man still remain in the spirit, though not visible to it, and if they be not removed by the strong soap and lye of the purgation of this night, the spirit cannot attain to the pureness of the divine union.'¹ The 'I' is not wholly destroyed, the old habits have left their traces, there are many imperfections of which the soul is unconscious. 'Delicta quis intelligit? ab occultis meis munda me' (Ps. xviii. 13).

The dark night is a certain inflowing of God into the soul which cleanses it of its ignorances and imperfections, habitual, natural, and spiritual.²

But it may be asked: Why does the soul call the divine light, which enlightens the soul and purges it of its ignorances,

¹ St. John of the Cross, *Dark Night* (Baker, p. 71).

² *Ibid.* p. 78.

the dark night? I reply, that the divine wisdom is, for two reasons, not night and darkness only, but pain and torment also to the soul. The first is, the divine wisdom is so high that it transcends the capacity of the soul, and therefore is, in that respect, darkness. The second reason is based on the meanness and impurity of the soul, and in that respect the divine wisdom is painful to it, afflictive and dark also.¹

St. John compares the soul to an owl in the noonday sun, blinded by excess of light.

It is for this reason that St. Dionysius and other mystic theologians call infused contemplation a ray of darkness, that is, for the unenlightened and unpurified soul, because this great supernatural light masters the natural power of the reason and takes away its natural way of understanding. . . . This dim contemplation is, in its beginnings, painful also to the soul. For as the infused divine contemplation contains many excellences in the highest degree, and the soul, which is the recipient, because not yet pure, is involved in many miseries, the result is—as two contraries cannot co-exist in the same subject—that the soul must suffer and be in pain.²

When the rays of this pure light strike upon the soul, in order to expel its impurities, the soul perceives itself to be so unclean and miserable that it seems as if God had set Himself against it, and itself were set against God. . . . The soul seeing distinctly in this bright and pure light, though dimly, its own impurity, acknowledges its own unworthiness before God and all creatures. That which pains it still more is the fear it has that it never will be worthy, and that all its goodness is gone.³

This little catena of texts from St. John of the Cross gives the general idea of this form of mystical experience which he describes at length in the *Dark Night*, Book II. Let us see how our psychological theory will apply to it. In the Night of Sense the negative idea detached the will from its affections to created things and, in thus purifying it, enabled it to respond to the impress with love, giving a growing 'sense' of the presence of God. In this purgation the negative idea has only a limited dynamism adjusted by grace to the capacity of the will. It is the revelation

¹ *Dark Night*, p. 79.

² *Ibid.* p. 80.

³ *Ibid.* p. 81.

by faith of God to the will as the Supreme Good. But in the Night of the Spirit the negative idea has a new and terrible force, it is no longer doled out to meet the will's capacity, it is excessive and awful in its energy. It is now the revelation of God to the will as the Supreme Holiness, one veil of the Godhead has been withdrawn and the soul is scalded in light. The will cannot react with that love which gives comfort and the 'sense' of presence, it is terrified and its love finds self-expression in a fearful sense of its own unworthiness. The will feels the vast gulf between itself and its Love. Imperfections and failings, forgotten and self-forgiven faults, swarm up from the depths of the deepest oblivion and the soul sees itself a leper. The will is dragged from its End by the weight of its sins, no longer seen by the rushlight of reason, but in the blaze of Divine justice. The will feels sin as it is, an offence against Infinite Holiness, and this consciousness of sin causes a 'sense' of remoteness from God which is a 'sense' of absence. It is the absence of God, not His presence, which is felt in the Dark Night of the Spirit.

Hence those feelings of despair, approaching to the conviction of damnation, which we find in the narratives of mystics who have passed through this experience. It differs from the most acute 'conviction of sin' in the revivalistic conversion-psychose. 'They who enter this night have, generally, had much sweetness in God, and served him greatly; but now, to see themselves strangers to so much happiness, and unable to recover it, causes them the greatest affliction.'¹ It is not due to despair as a mere failure of hope, to lack of 'assurance,' as Protestant theologians would term it, but to the sense of their own vileness and the Holiness of God.

In this purgation

The desires of sense and spirit are lulled to sleep and mortified, unable to relish anything either human or divine; the affections of the soul are thwarted and brought low, become helpless, and have

¹ *Dark Night*, p. 89.

nothing to rest upon; the imagination is fettered, and unable to make any profitable reflections, the memory is gone, and the will, too, is dry and afflicted, and all the faculties are empty, and, moreover, a dense and heavy cloud overshadows the soul, distresses it and holds it as if it were far away from God.¹

By this process the last roots of self-will, of self-complacency, are grubbed up. As the ultra-violet rays of the solar spectrum kill off bacteria, so the negative idea of God kills off the hidden defects of the will and fits it for a fuller experience.

There is a third purgation on the mystic way, which St. Teresa has described as preceding the highest state of union with God, that habitual presence which mystics call the spiritual marriage:—

This is a trance of the senses and faculties of the soul, for everything else combines, as I told you, to make the agony more intense. The understanding realises acutely what cause there is for grief in separation from God, and His Majesty now augments this sorrow by a vivid manifestation of Himself, thus increasing her anguish to such a degree that the sufferer gives vent to loud cries, which she cannot stifle, however patient and accustomed to pain she may be, because this torture is not corporal, but attacks the innermost recesses of the soul.²

This is the dart of love, a new enforcement of the idea of God, revealing Him as the Infinite Reward, the Final End of the soul.

The type of mystical phenomena which has attracted most attention from the agnostic psychologist is the ecstasy. Ecstasy may be defined as a mystical experience of such intensity that the normal sense relations of the soul with the outward world are completely suspended, the subject perceives nothing of what is going on around him, is most frequently incapable of movement, and cannot terminate the experience at will. The loss of sensibility and movement make ecstasy analogous to certain morbid states, like catalepsy or intoxication by opium, but it is sharply differentiated from these states in its sequel, a

¹ *Dark Night*, p. 133.

² *Interior Castle*, Mansion VI., chap. xi. par. 3.

notable addition of moral energy. In some types of ecstasy there is speech and movement, but the subject remains unconscious of his surroundings. This will suggest analogies to certain hypnotic states, but with analogous differences in the moral value of the sequel. The hypnotic subject is not notably improved by his experience, either physically or morally, but the ecstatic shows increased will-power in the pursuit of moral good. The hypnotic subject may be roused by whoever has hypnotised him; the ecstatic can only be recalled by someone to whom moral obedience is due, a director, a religious superior, etc. The recall of an ecstatic is essentially a moral act, and has been exercised by those to whom the superior has delegated authority for the purpose. Thus it is that even in the external manifestation of this experience there is a marked difference from the morbid or quasi-morbid states to which it has been assimilated.¹

The subjective experience of ecstasies is of immense variety, with one marked characteristic in common: an immense psychic activity, a sense of life more full than ordinary. This feature of inner activity is a standing challenge to agnostic psychology, which first treated it as an illusion, a hallucination, and then sought to explain it by reduction to a pure affective state. Murisier thus analyses an advanced mystical state:—

What is this simple idea of the Divinity which takes the place of the complex vision and the associations which have been got rid of? It is often an abstract idea analogous to the idea of good, the supreme object of the meditations of Plotinus, or to the law of the causality of pain, whose knowledge leads the Buddhist to the repose of Nirvana. It is oftener a vague confused image, drawn from earlier representations, or rather it is the residue of these representations which are fused, drained, simplified by the gradual blotting-out of distinction and contour. . . . The isolated image, the sovereign light, is soon in turn extinguished. Memory, imagination, even understanding is lost, as the mystics say.²

¹ Cf. Poulain, *op. cit.*, chap. xviii., and Saudreau, *Les Faits Extraordinaires*, chap. vi.

² *Les maladies du sentiment religieux* (Alcan, 1901, p. 61), quoted Poulain, p. 273.

He declares that ecstasy ends in the annihilation of personality, that it is an absolutely monoideistic state, with finally a total extinction of consciousness. We reduce the field of consciousness to one idea, we concentrate on that one idea abstractively until it vanishes from consciousness. Thus we get the idea of Nothing, and basing ourselves on the maxim that 'where there is nothing, there is God,' we direct all our affective energy to that nothing, and in so doing get an affective sense of God which, if pushed to the psychic breaking-point, results in unconsciousness, and so we have ecstasy. Now, this process may well account for the Buddhist 'ecstasy,' as it would conceivably produce a psychic and somatic lethargy; it might even explain the alleged ecstasies of Plotinus, for their affective value may have been only a psychic throw-back, the retrojection of an emotion, subsequent to the state, into the state itself by an easy illusion of memory; but it is inadequate to account psychologically for the relations of ecstasies we find in St. Teresa, Blessed Angela of Foligno, St. Catherine of Siena, and other mystics. Clearly, the experience St. Teresa refers to, in the following passage, is quite other than a purely negative Nirvana:—

'But,' you will ask me, 'if the mind cannot afterwards remember the very sublime favours Our Lord bestows in this mansion, what profit do they bring it?' O my daughters! their value cannot be over-rated, for though the recipient is incapable of describing them, they are deeply imprinted in the centre of the soul and are never forgotten. 'How can they be remembered, if nothing is seen, and the powers of the soul do not comprehend them?' I, too, do not understand this, but I know that certain truths of the greatness of God remain so impressed on the spirit by this favour, that, did not faith teach it Who He is and that it is bound to believe He is God, it would henceforth worship Him as such, as Jacob did when he saw the ladder.¹

Does not this, too, reveal a cognitive, as well as an affective activity?—

Before the soul fell into the trance, it thought itself to be careful about not offending God, and that it did what it could in proportion

¹ St. Teresa, *Interior Castle*, Mansion VI, chap. iv. par. 6.

to its strength ; but now that it has attained to this state, in which the Sun of Justice shines upon it, and makes it open its eyes, it beholds so many moths that it would gladly close them again. It is not so truly the child of the noble eagle that it can gaze upon the sun ; but, for the few instants it can keep them open, it beholds itself wholly unclean. It remembers the words : ‘ Who shall be just in Thy presence ? ’ When it looks on this Divine Sun, the brightness thereof dazzles it—when it looks on itself, its eyes are blinded by the dust ; the little dove is blind. So it happens very often : the soul is utterly blinded, absorbed, amazed, dizzy at the vision of so much grandeur. It is in rapture that true humility is acquired—humility that will never say any good of self, nor suffer others to do so.¹

To awaken such interior energy a mere philosophical abstraction would be absurdly inadequate. We might produce a state of coma or lethargy, but we could hardly arrive at an outward coma and an interior super-activity. Ecstasy is not a depression of activity, but an augmentation by concentration. The negative idea of God is impressed on the will with such measure and proportion that it wholly absorbs its affective energy, and derivatively drains all the other psychic energies. Hence, during the experience, the soul has no force left, save what suffices to maintain the animal life in existence. A little more and the mystic would cease to live. Breathing almost ceases, the bodily temperature falls, the physical state seems almost like death to the onlooker. And with this collapse of the bodily organism there is this superabundant psychic life, showing itself, when the ecstatic recovers normal consciousness, often in some sudden and extraordinary progress in virtue. That ecstasy involves a lowering of psychic activity is in flat contradiction with the testimony of those who have experienced it, the only competent witnesses as to the psychic facts. If we accept their relations as psychological documents, we are not entitled to explain them by a process which would justly deprive them of all evidential value. Scientific probity must respect the integrity of the fact.

¹ St. Teresa, *Life*, chap. xx. par. 37 (Baker, 1904, p. 169).

It is during ecstasy, as a rule, that the Saints have received those particular favours, visions, locutions, and revelations which are distinct in character from the general obscure contemplation of mystical experience. These are of a charismatic order, being essentially *gratiae gratis datae*, and psychology has nothing to say to them, when genuine. When the visions or locutions are perceived by the senses or the imagination there is ample room for illusions of every kind. St. John of the Cross devotes several chapters of his *Ascent of Carmel* to showing how illusion may be detected, and even modern psychology adds but little to what he has said, despite our greater knowledge of morbid psychoses. The intellectual visions or locutions, higher phenomena where the idea is communicated to the intellect directly without images or any given of sense, are less liable to illusion as they are more supernatural. Their reality has been challenged by those who deny their possibility *a priori*; so have miracles. You cannot prove either to the man who denies God. St. John of the Cross is very formal in his doctrine that these extraordinary favours should not be sought after, desired, or even dwelt upon.¹

Père Poulain, as we have seen, marks off very sharply mystical experience from what he considers the non-mystical prayer of simplicity. The Abbé Saudreau and Père de Besse would separate ordinary mystical contemplation from the extraordinary or miraculous type, such as ecstasy obviously is. These boundaries are somewhat artificial, for who can tell the precise point of division? The prayer of simplicity melts into the prayer of quiet, and quiet deepens to union; union flames to ecstasy, and

¹ Cf. St. John of the Cross, *Ascent of Carmel*, Bk. III. chap. 7. 'The spiritual director must be therefore careful not to make his penitent narrow-minded by attaching any importance to these supernatural visitations; for they are nothing else but the motes of the Spirit, and he who shall give his attention to these alone will in the end have no spirituality at all. Yea, rather let him wean him from all visions and locutions, and guide him into the liberty and darkness of faith, where he shall receive of the abundance of the Spirit, and consequently the knowledge and understanding of the words of God.'—*Ascent of Carmel*, Bk. II. chap. 19 par. 13.

ecstasy passes in the spiritual marriage. They are rather subjective divisions, varying with each soul which is favoured with mystical experience. In themselves they may well be one in essence, but individuated by the spiritual progress of the mystic. All are in the order of faith. That which we have called the negative idea of God, because it can only be expressed by negations, which seems to vanish into nothingness when we try to formulate it, yet which has such stupendous dynamism when impressed on the will, may well be that unknown psychic element in an act of divine faith which marks it off so sharply in our experience from merely human or scientific faith. If that be so, if the hidden psychic element in the faith of the everyday Catholic be the latent mystic idea of God, the *prima veritas*, in which and by which we believe, then we have a golden thread which links up the prayer of the most ordinary of the faithful with the ecstatic orison of the great saint. We would then be able to trace out the progress of spiritual experience, from the conversion-psychose to ecstasy, as a continuous growth in faith, the stages being set by the degrees of charity attained by the soul. We will take this theological continuity and look at it from the psychological point of view of the reaction of the will to the impress of the negative idea of God.

When this negative idea is first found in the innermost self by grace, be it by infusion from without or by aiding the powers of the soul to push abstraction from the given of consciousness beyond the natural psychic ultimate, it is unrecognised, but not, in a measure, unfelt. Its proper place is the apex of the will, as it is formed in the apex of the intelligence, but in the unconverted there is little or no vital energy to be found there. The whole force of the soul is spent in the lower planes of consciousness, the inner man is extroverted, turned towards the things of sense and of self. The first action of the negative idea is general and gradual, an unconscious drawing of the will towards itself. There is a faint growth of vital energy in the apex

of the soul, and any increase there means a large diversion from the total sum of vital energy. There the vital potential is at its highest, and, to supply it, the vital potential in the lower will and other powers must decrease. Hence, the sense of discomfort, of incapacity, of disrelish for customary acts which goes with the early stages of the conversion psychose. The invisible, unfelt attraction draws away the soul from the things to which it was attached. There is the sense of stress, of conflict. The old habits and feelings grow weaker, there is less attraction towards them. As the drawing of the centre increases, the ordinary field of consciousness loses more and more of its psychic energy. Vices lose their grip and there is an increase, as it were by suction, in the number of centres of volitional instability. There is an analogous process in the cognitive order. Views are weakened, the power of intellectual prejudice lowered. The will is no longer forcibly attracted to them and ceases to buttress the cognitive element by its affections. What is doubtful and hypothetical in these views becomes more apparent when the agreeable in them ceases to attract. There is a sense of intellectual deficiency generated, a loss of the cocksure spirit, a growing conflict felt with truth, an expanding doubt and desire for knowledge. Again, suction creates centres of instability. Given the advent from without of the nascent idea, the field of consciousness is already sapped and mined, and disintegration with reformation follows. Under the growing attraction of the negative idea the conscious elements regroup themselves. All the while the soul is unconscious of this central attraction in itself, but it realises a something beyond itself, yet within, when it observes the steady direction of the whole psychic process. There is a sense of an invisible educator aiding and shaping what comes from without. The interior attraction co-operates with the preacher.

But although the will is thus attracted by the negative idea, the action must be reinforced before it can react with that conscious love which gives the 'sense' of presence.

The mere readjustment of the field of consciousness is in itself a 'natural' process; it does not pass beyond the power of ordinary psychic methods to accomplish. The soul continues extroverted, although its point of view is changed. The 'self' has been drilled but not substantially altered. The 'I' has been taught to look to God, but it still stands erect. Self-will has been rectified, but it is still self-will. Before the negative idea can exert its specific action the will must be purified, as we have seen in the Night of Sense. Then mystical experience proper begins, as it continues, in suffering. It is very probable that more Christians receive mystical experience than is usually thought, still the vast bulk do not progress much beyond a well-directed cultivation of the self for God. They build up their characters admirably, but it is *their* characters. They will not lose all, including self, to find all; and so they remain in the middle passage. Others have to fulfil active duties; their vocation is that of Martha, busied about many things. Only the comparatively few correspond with the inward energies of the negative idea and make progress in the mystic way.

There is a psychic parallelism between the conversion-psychose and the Night of Sense, indeed the latter psychose has been termed mystical conversion. St. John of the Cross has compared the three mystical nights to periods of darkness in the natural night—the early dark of sense, the black midnight of the spirit, and the dark that precedes the dawn. If we take this analogy, the conversion-psychose would be represented by the twilight. By a kindred metaphor, the prayer of quiet would represent the first streaks of dawn and ecstasy the glory of the noontide. The miraculous and extraordinary features are but the individual accidents of the various states; they may well serve to delimit frontiers from the director's point of view, but the states, in themselves, show a continuity, a growth. Now, growth is never uniform, for it is a vital, not a mechanical, act; it may be checked and promoted by activity, but it is largely independent of our efforts. It is

only those weeds, our sins and failings, whose rate of growth we can wholly direct, for that is all we own in the garden of the soul. The seed the Master plants, we can only water and watch. We cannot turn the violet into the rose, or change the dwarf into the full-sized variety, but we can keep off the slugs and keep the blooms fresh.

JOHN HOWLEY.

PRIMATE REGINALD OF ARMAGH

BY REV. M. H. MACINERNEY, O.P.

I

A SINGULARLY attractive and appealing figure is that of Primate Reginald, the first Dominican Archbishop of Armagh. His character, so far as we can discern it now, was a blend of sweetness, piety, and unworldliness. An early disciple of St. Dominic, he was privileged to witness one of the kindly miracles wrought by that high-minded and gentle saint. He was, perhaps, the only Irish Dominican—using the phrase in a somewhat loose sense—who was brought into personal contact with the illustrious Founder of the Order.¹

¹ Primate Reginald was an Irish Dominican only in the sense that, while of foreign birth, he became the Dominican occupant of an Irish see. There appears to be no real ground for Lynch's elaborate statement (*De Praesulibus Hiberniae*, T.C.D. copy, I. 57, 58) that two Irishmen, named Peter Madden and Anthony Geoghegan, figured among St. Dominic's earliest disciples; that Madden became the first Prior of Segovia, by special appointment of the holy founder; and that these two Irishmen journeyed to their own land, with Reginald, in 1218: 'Petrus Madinum (quem Segoviensi monasterio condendo S. Dominicus praefecit) et Antonium Geoganum, ambos Hibernos, illum ex Omaddinis Silanmchiae, hunc e Geochoganis Midiae, Reginaldum in Hiberniam A.D. 1218 proficiscentem comitatos fuisse.' Here we have a curious cluster of errors. In the first place, Reginald did not come to Ireland in 1218, nor did he visit this country, so far as I can discover, until thirty years later. There was no Dominican convent at Segovia until very late in 1218, or early in the following year. It was founded on the occasion of St. Dominic's visit to Segovia, where he passed the Christmas of 1218. Its first prior was not Peter Madden, but a holy religious, who is popularly styled Blessed Corbolan the Simple. The convent of Madrid was founded about the same time by Peter of Medina, a Spaniard, who may possibly be the original of the fictitious Peter Madden (Drane, *Hist. of St. Dominic*, 1891, pp. 286, 287; Mortier, *Hist. des Maîtres Généraux*, i. 103). That Anthony Geoghegan was also an imaginary personage seems tolerably certain. The O'Maddens were chiefs of Siol-Anmchadha; their territory comprised the barony of Longford in County Galway, together with the parish of Lusmagh, on the east side of the Shannon, in the King's County (O'Dugan's *Topographical Poems*, ed. O'Donovan, xlv. (350); cf. *Tribes and Customs of Hy-Many*, 69, 143-153). The MacGeoghegans, lords of Moycashel in Westmeath, were somewhat near neighbours of the O'Maddens. The story that two scions of these midland septs figured among

In Primate Reginald's life-story there is something enigmatic withal. His character stands before us in limpid simplicity, and it is a character of uncommon piety and grace; but the heedlessness of historians has left many blanks in the record of his career. His very name is variously given by various writers. His surname, if he ever had one, is nowhere mentioned. His Christian name appears in all manner of fanciful forms. Existing manuscripts of the contemporary *Vitæ Fratrum*—a Dominican *Fioretti* of rare interest and charm, compiled by Gerard de Frachet, and worthily translated by Father Placid Conway—usually give his name as 'Reginald.' The same form is consistently found in manuscripts of the *Chronica Ordinis*, another work which we owe to the industrious pen of Gerard de Frachet. This preponderance of manuscript authority, occurring as it does in coeval works of peculiar value, seems ample warrant for our adoption of 'Reginald' as the true form of this worthy prelate's name. In the *Annals of Ulster* he is styled 'Raighnedh' and 'Raighned,' and the latter form is also adopted by the Four Masters. Other writers, according to their fancy, designate him as 'Reiner,' 'Rayner,' 'Raynald,' 'Reinold,' 'Reynard,' 'Ronald,' and so on.¹

the first disciples of St. Dominic is, on the face of it, improbable in the extreme. That story, with other notes of a much more valuable character, was received by Archdeacon Lynch from Father John O'Hart, a distinguished Sligo man and confessor of the Faith, who was Provincial of the Irish Dominicans from 1660 until 1669, dying about the year 1672. 'R. P. Joannis O'Hart dignissimi sui ordinis in Hibernia nuper Provincialis (cui plura huic operi à me inserta accepta refero) literis accepi'—such is the preface to the story already quoted from Lynch. Father O'Hart was 'a most diligent student of the antiquities of our country'; both O'Heyne and De Burgo bewail the loss of his notes (O'Heyne, *Irish Dominicans*, pp. 240-241; De Burgo, *Hib. Dom.*, 526). But it would seem from the passage just quoted that a good deal of the historical material amassed by Father O'Hart must have found its way into the hands of Archdeacon Lynch, who made excellent use of it, as witness his sketches of Ross MacGeoghegan and other Irish Dominican Bishops, which are unusually detailed and valuable.

¹ In Reichert's critical edition of the *Vitæ Fratrum* and the *Chronica Ordinis* (Louvain, 1896) Reginald is thrice mentioned; his name occurs on pp. 80, 130, 329. He is styled 'Reginald' in nine out of thirteen manuscripts, collated on page 80, in ten out of thirteen collated on page 130, and in all manuscripts which contain the first recension of the *Chronica Ordinis*. In the second recension his name is not mentioned. Gerard de Frachet intended his *Chronica* to be the sixth and final section of his *Vitæ Fratrum*; both works are edited in one volume by Father Reichert.

Reginald's nationality, no less than his Christian name, is a question on which historians agree to differ. Echard suggests that he was most probably an Irishman, for 'he was raised to the dignity of Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland, an office which could properly be filled only by a native Irishman, conversant with the Irish tongue; but this point,' adds Echard warily, 'I willingly leave to the careful criticism of our Irish friends.'¹ This *a priori* reasoning does not seem very conclusive, for Reginald's immediate predecessor in Armagh was Primate Albert Suerbeer, a German ecclesiastic, whom most of our leading authorities misdescribe as a Dominican. It is poignantly true, as Echard observes, that only an Irish-born prelate, skilled in what was then the daily idiom of the Irish people, would have been properly fitted to govern the primatial diocese of Ireland. But it is equally and sadly true that many of Reginald's successors in Armagh, and many of their contemporaries in other sees throughout Ireland, down to the Reformation period, were ignorant of the language of the people to whom they were supposed to preach 'in season and out of season, reproving, entreating, and rebuking in all patience and doctrine.' Many of the English prelates appointed to Irish sees were quite incapable of preaching intelligibly to the great majority of their diocesans; some of them never set foot within the borders of their Irish dioceses, whose revenues they consumed.

De Burgo, for no visible reason, twice claims Primate Reginald as an Irishman.² Brenan, in his turn, confidently asserts that Reginald was 'a native of Ireland,' and that, before his appointment to Armagh, he 'had already distinguished himself by his apostolical career in various parts of Italy, along the Rhine, and in Switzerland.'³ These missionary journeys seem to be a product of the historical

¹ 'Archiepiscopus Armachanus et Hybernix primas evectus est, quod munus nonnisi indigenæ et ejus linguæ homini conveniebat, quæ tamen Hybernorum nostrorum diligentiori criterio lubens permitto.'—Echard, *Scriptores Ord. Præd.*, Paris, 1719, vol. i. p. 22.

² *Hibernia Dominicana*, 458, 533.

³ *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, p. 298.

imagination ; certain it is that Echard, the only authority cited by Brenan in this connexion, says no word about them. They are not mentioned, so far as I can ascertain, by any reliable historian. Ware's verdict still holds the field as the last word on this discussion : ' I have not been able to discover, whether this Prelate was of the English Nation or not ; but I am of opinion he was a foreigner.'¹

There is not an iota of evidence to show that Primate Reginald was an Englishman, and there is just as little evidence to show that he was an Irishman. His name, in whatever form we choose to take it, is wholly un-Irish. His lack of a family surname is another indication of his foreign nationality. Surnames were very common in Ireland in the thirteenth century, as anybody may verify for himself by looking through our Irish annals ; in fact, of twelve Dominican prelates appointed to Irish sees in that century, we know the surnames of all but two, Reginald of Armagh and Christian of Ardfert. On the other hand, such patronymics were by no means common on the Continent at that period. Of the scores of foreign Dominicans commemorated in the *Vitæ Fratrum*, nearly all are mentioned by their Christian names—Blessed Jordan of Saxony, for instance—their native town or country supplying the place of a surname. The fact, then, that Primate Reginald's surname, if he ever had one, is nowhere mentioned, affords strong *prima facie* evidence of his un-Irish origin and upbringing. It also furnishes presumptive proof that he was neither an Englishman nor an Anglo-Irishman.

At that period surnames of some kind or other were in common use among Englishmen and Palesmen. If we glance, for instance, through the list of Dublin's guild-merchants of the year 1226, we shall find that they nearly all rejoice in some species of surname. A man's trade, his place of origin, his personal characteristics—these furnish the bulk of the surnames of Dublin's burghers in 1226, though family names are occasionally noticeable.² The

¹ Ware-Harris, i. 67.

² See list of guild-merchants in Gilbert, *Hist. and Municip. Documents*, pp. 82-88.

fact that Primate Reginald appears to have had no such surname is another indication of his foreign origin; it suggests that he was neither English nor Anglo-Irish.

Whatever Reginald's nationality may have been we can safely place his birth somewhere between 1190 and 1200; he was a Dominican at Bologna in 1218, being then presumably in early manhood. It is very improbable that an Irishman of the old race, or even a Palesman, could have been, at that early date, a member of an infant Order, the very name of which was unknown in Ireland. Besides, as the sequel will show, one of the most notable traits of Reginald's character was his predilection for living in France or Italy, a predilection markedly displayed in the course of his career, and which would seem to stamp him as either a Frenchman or an Italian. Indeed, his only namesake among the saintly Dominicans of his time, whose names are written in the *Vitæ Fratrum*, was Blessed Reginald of Orleans, a holy and distinguished Frenchman. That one, as well as the other, hailed from the pleasant land of France, seems entirely probable, though the balance of probability would seem to favour the view that Reginald of Armagh was of Italian birth.

Towards the close of 1218, Primate Reginald makes his first appearance on the stage of history. In April of that year, four Dominicans had settled at Bologna, in a religious house generously ceded to them by the Canons Regular of Roncevaux in Navarre. These Canons Regular were Spaniards, countrymen of St. Dominic, whom they knew and revered. Their friendship for the holy Founder, coupled with their brotherly feeling for his disciples, who still wore the habit of Canons Regular, caused them to extend a hearty welcome to the new Dominican foundation, and to give expression to that welcome in a highly practical way. St. Dominic, on his side, was eager to send his spiritual sons to Bologna, then a university town famous throughout the world for the learning of its professors and the multitude of its students. In this atmosphere of culture he was eager to establish a foundation,

and the kindly Canons of Mascarella came opportunely to his aid. They granted their little church and monastery to his disciples, and retired to another centre. The new foundation was poor and humble enough to satisfy the most exacting lover of poverty. The obscure abode of the new Dominican colony was called Santa Maria di Mascarella, from the street or locality in which it stood. Here the devoted group of Dominicans (whose number soon increased to six, though Reginald was not yet among them) laboured and prayed, enduring meanwhile the discomforts of extremest poverty.

In the course of November, 1218, St. Dominic himself, on his way from Rome to Spain, visited the struggling community. Their numbers had notably increased, but their dire poverty was such that they sometimes lacked the bare necessities of life. Their resources were sadly overtaxed during the brief visit of St. Dominic and his travelling companions; a total of twelve or fourteen religious might easily, to a harassed procurator, seem 'a large community.' Reginald, the future Archbishop of Armagh, was present on this occasion, and is described as 'a deeply religious man' (*vir valde religiosus*) by the contemporary chronicler—no mean tribute from one who knew how common a thing was extraordinary fervour among the Dominicans of that primitive time. Reginald was an eye-witness of the crisis which came, and of the miracle wrought by St. Dominic for the comfort of his brethren. Reginald's account of the incident is thus reproduced by Gerard de Frachet:—

Brother Reginald, a deeply religious man, who was once a Papal penitentiary, and afterwards became Archbishop of Armagh, tells us that he was present on one occasion at Bologna, when the procurator went to our holy Father, complaining that he had only two loaves to set before a large community. Whereupon this faithful imitator of his Lord, taking the two loaves, broke them into fragments, and then, full of trust in God, *Who is gracious to all that call upon Him, and filleth every living creature with His blessing*, he made over them the sign of our Redemption, and then told the server to go round and put two or three pieces upon each table.

When the brother had gone once round the refectory and there was still some bread to spare, he went round it a second and a third time, and yet out of a small quantity in the beginning there was plenty left. What need for further words? The brother continued to supply the tables until all the brethren were satisfied, and more bread was supplied from on high than man was able to consume.¹

This sober narrative of an eye-witness is obviously trustworthy; its details may have been gleaned by Gerard de Frachet from Primate Reginald himself. Indeed, it is more than probable that the two men were personally known to each other. In view of Reginald's repeated journeys through France, and his long years of service as penitentiary at the Papal Court in Italy and at Lyons, it seems highly improbable that he should have been unacquainted with Gerard de Frachet, who was one of the most active and esteemed Dominicans in Southern France at the time. During Reginald's residence of nearly three years at Lyons, Gerard de Frachet, who was then actual or titular prior at Limoges, was practically his neighbour.²

The miracle witnessed by Primate Reginald is regarded by Father Mortier and Miss Drane, two of the most reliable of latter-day writers on Dominican history, as having been performed by St. Dominic during his brief sojourn in the Mascarella convent at Bologna, in the month of November, 1218. With that view I entirely agree, for a variety of reasons. In the first place, it is favoured by the constant tradition which designates the Mascarella as the scene of a miraculous multiplication of bread by the patriarch of the Friars Preachers. A table on which the miraculous bread was placed is still preserved in the Mascarella church, and was the subject of a careful examination, by command of the Cardinal Archbishop of Bologna, as lately as 1881. The upper and lower surfaces of this table are adorned with paintings representing the miracle. One of these rude paintings is supposed to date from the early part of

¹ *Lives of the Brethren*, translated by F. Placid Conway, 1906, pp. 59, 60; cf. *Vitæ Fratrum*, ed. Reichert, p. 80; Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux*, i. 94-99.

² See details of Gerard's life in Reichert's Introduction to the *Vitæ Fratrum*, pp. xi.-xv.

the fifteenth century; the other is attributed, with more or less certainty, to the thirteenth century. The upper and more modern picture represents twelve persons seated at an oblong table, in the midst of whom appears St. Dominic with his hand raised in benediction. Standing before the table are two angels, only their heads and wings being now discernible. The same subject is treated in the lower and more ancient painting.¹ The table itself was constantly regarded as a precious relic, and carefully preserved in a niche, guarded by iron bars, close by an altar in the church of Santa Maria in Mascarella; notwithstanding these precautions, it has suffered not a little from the depredations of the devout. Father Ludovico of Palermo, who inspected this interesting and historic relic in 1528, intimates with sufficient clearness that the tradition of St. Dominic's miracle was still vivid at the Mascarella. Indeed, the table and its paintings, piously preserved during so many ages, are mute but eloquent witnesses of the tradition. We may regard the paintings as unhistorical in some incidental details—and I regard them as unhistorical so far as the number of the community, the introduction of angels as servers, and certain other matters, are concerned. Such incidental blemishes are negligible; they do not impair the force of the tradition which the paintings as a whole are intended to embody. There is such a thing as artistic licence, quite as legitimate in its way as poetic licence.

The tradition of St. Dominic's miracle in the Mascarella convent has suffered slightly from the cross-fire of two friendly forces. Malvenda, followed by Echard, contends that this particular miracle was wrought, not in the Mascarella priory in 1218, but at the convent of St. Nicholas, in Bologna, in either 1219 or 1220. On the other hand, Father Ludovico of Palermo, by his uncritical account of the Mascarella miracle, and by his failure to distinguish

¹ Augusta T. Drane, *The History of St. Dominic*, 1891, p. 278. Miss Drane's authority for this local information is a brochure, entitled *Cenni Storici sulla Tavola di S. Domenico*, published at Bologna in 1883, after the examination above recorded.

clearly between that prodigy and a subsequent miracle at St. Nicholas' priory, has wrought much confusion, and has partly misled some excellent modern writers, such as Miss Drane and Father Mortier.

To understand rightly the question at issue, we must remember that St. Dominic is credited with having performed, on four distinct occasions, this miracle of the multiplication of bread. The first of these prodigies took place at San Sisto, in Rome; it is attested by Vincent of Beauvais, not a first-hand authority, but an eminent and most respectable writer. The second also happened at San Sisto; it differs in some important details from the former miracle; above all, it is recorded, on the unimpeachable evidence of eye-witnesses, in the contemporary narrative of Sister Cecilia, which is a document of the highest importance and value. In both of these episodes angels appear and distribute miraculous bread to the brethren assembled in the refectory; in the second miracle wine is also produced by the power of God and the intercession of His saint.¹ The third, which we may call the Mascarella miracle, is attested by Primate Reginald, who was an eye-witness of its performance. Reginald's narrative, reproduced in the contemporary *Vitæ Fratrum*, is a document of quite exceptional value; it is sober, clear, and circumstantial. The remarkable feature of Primate Reginald's version is that no angels appear in the Mascarella miracle; everything happens in a quiet, unpretentious, matter-of-fact fashion. The server goes round from table to table, and scarcely discovers until the end that a miracle has occurred.² The fourth and last of these miracles also happened at Bologna, in the convent of St. Nicholas delle Vigne, whither the community had removed from Santa Maria in Mascarella. This miracle, wrought most probably between August and November, 1219, is attested by Bonviso of Piacenza, who was an eye-witness of the fact, and whose sworn depositions are included in the acts of

¹ Augusta T. Drane, *The History of St. Dominic*, pp. 209-212.

² *Ibid.* pp. 276, 277.

St. Dominic's canonisation. Bonviso was procurator of the convent of St. Nicholas when the miracle occurred, and was a keenly interested spectator of the proceedings; he had just informed the holy patriarch, in presence of the waiting community, that not a morsel of bread was left in the house. From his testimony we learn that two angels, in the guise of young men, entered the refectory; they carried two baskets, one of bread and the other of dried figs, so that the brethren all had abundance.¹ Another episode which occurred at St. Nicholas, possibly at this time, but most probably in 1220 or 1221, was the miraculous production of wine by St. Dominic on behalf of sick brethren in the infirmary.²

We can now return to the Mascarella miracle, of which Primate Reginald was an eye-witness. Some confusion has been imported into the story of that miracle, partly by Echard's theory, partly also by Ludovico of Palermo's uncritical version of the occurrence. Writing more than three hundred years after the event, and having little in the way of documentary evidence before him, Father Ludovico thus narrates the miracle which we associate with the name of Primate Reginald:—

After our sweet Father, St. Dominic, had finished the arduous business committed to him by the holy Pontiff at Rome, he came to Bologna and lodged at the Mascarella, where the friars still abode, not being able to go to St. Nicholas by reason of the rooms being yet too fresh and damp. And it happened on a day that, on account of the great multitude of the brethren, there was no bread except a few very little pieces; and the blessing being given, the good Father raised his eyes and his heart to God, and lo! the doors being closed, there appeared two beautiful youths, with two baskets of the whitest loaves, and giving one thereof to each friar, they so multiplied that there remained an abundance, enough for three

¹ *Acta Sanctorum*, August, i. 632, 633; Drane, *Hist. of St. Dominic*, p. 365.

² *Vitæ Fratrum*, pp. 27, 28. Miss Drane (p. 277) represents this miracle as having taken place in the Mascarella convent, which seems very improbable; it was attested by Rudolph of Faenza, who was procurator of the convent of St. Nicholas in 1220 and 1221, and whose office would have made him specially conversant with such incidents. If a miracle of this nature had taken place in the Mascarella convent, it would doubtless have been mentioned by Primate Reginald, who was there at the time.

days. This great miracle happened twice at Rome and twice at Bologna. And my dear friend the rector of Santa Maria Mascarella told me that every year, on the same day when the holy angels brought the heavenly bread, most sweet odours, which lasted forty hours, were perceived in the space then occupied by the refectory.¹

Between this picturesque narrative and Reginald's unadorned statement there is a curious and suggestive contrast. Reginald, who was present, saw no angels in the guise of beautiful youths; he merely saw the server prosaically going his rounds. The truth seems to be that the Sicilian chronicler has painted this episode in colours borrowed from the similar but more striking and dramatic miracles of San Sisto and St. Nicholas. The angels which appear in the pictures of this Mascarella miracle may be said to owe their existence, partly to a vivid tradition of angelic appearances in the refectories of the two priories just mentioned, partly also, to the exigencies of the pictorial art. It were no easy task for a painter to suggest a miracle while depicting a lay-brother on his round from table to table.

Two miracles, and two only, in respect of the multiplication of bread, are recorded as having been wrought by St. Dominic in Bologna. One of these was witnessed by Bonviso, who expressly informs us that it happened in the convent of St. Nicholas. The other was witnessed by Primate Reginald, who merely states that it took place in the convent of Bologna. For reasons which we have already seen, it is certain that a miracle of this nature was performed by St. Dominic in the Mascarella convent in that city. Therefore we may legitimately infer—indeed, we must infer—that the Mascarella miracle and Primate Reginald's miracle were one and the same. In the face of Reginald's testimony, Father Ludovico's late and legendary version cannot stand. Father Mortier and Miss Drane have been somewhat led astray by Ludovico's story. The former accepts Ludovico's apocryphal angels; and Miss Drane goes so far as to suggest that St. Dominic, during his brief stay

¹ Drane, *ibid.* pp. 277, 278.

of a few days at the Mascarella convent, performed no fewer than three miracles. One of these is the miracle attested by Primate Reginald; another is Ludovico's picturesquely unreliable version of the same miracle; and the third is the miraculous production of wine, which, as we have seen, belongs to another time and place.¹

The Dominican community of the Mascarella must have been comforted and encouraged by St. Dominic's visit in the latter part of 1218, accompanied as that visit was by a gracious miracle, such as the kindly and large-hearted Father loved to perform. But the community's troubles were by no means at an end; the Fathers prayed and toiled in poverty and neglect; after a time the prospect of making headway against the apathy and indifference of the great University city seemed hopeless, at least to some. The advent of Blessed Reginald of Orleans, a month or so later, as prior of the community and St. Dominic's vicar in Italy, seemed to create no essential change in the situation. In a short time, however, the fiery eloquence of Blessed Reginald produced an enormous sensation throughout the city. Men flocked from all quarters to listen to his burning words. Some of the most brilliant among the University professors, such as Master Moneta and Master Roland of Cremona, resigned their chairs and assumed the Dominican habit. Early in 1219, the Dominican community removed to more commodious quarters at St. Nicholas delle Vigne, the rector of that church having yielded to the charm of Blessed Reginald's eloquence and enlisted among the disciples of St. Dominic. The new foundation was destined to be fruitful and glorious above measure; it was destined to be the last resting-place of St. Dominic himself, whose tomb is one of the triumphs of Christian art in Italy.

In this priory of St. Nicholas, afterwards renowned under the name of San Domenico di Bologna, Malvenda and Echard place the miracle of the multiplication of bread

¹ Drane, *The History of St. Dominic*, pp. 276-278; Mortier i. 98.

(which we have called the Mascarella miracle), ascribing it to the year 1219 or 1220. Echard, following Malvenda, contends that

the miracle was wrought in the convent of St. Nicholas, not in that of Santa Maria in Mascarella, as is clear from internal evidence. For the community in Bologna, before the arrival of Blessed Reginald of Orleans, towards the close of 1218, was extremely small. So small was it that some of the Fathers, seeing no hope of any probable addition to their numbers, desired to enter some other Order, as we learn from the *Vitæ Fratrum*, lib. 5, cap. i. par. 1. Here, however [in Primate Reginald's story of the miracle], a vast community is said to have witnessed the prodigy, which is an incontrovertible proof that the miracle occurred only after St. Dominic's return from Paris in August, 1219, when he went to Bologna and found there a large muster of the brethren.¹

Echard must have quoted merely from memory. His reference is wrong—the correct reference is lib. i. cap. 5, par. 1—and the passage to which he refers does not bear his interpretation. From that passage we learn that

when the Order of Preachers was still, as it were, a little flock and a young plantation, there arose among the friars of the Bologna community a certain tumult of temptation which filled them with depression and discouragement, wherefore *many of them* took counsel together as to the several Orders which they should enter; for they feared that the [Dominican] Order, being then a new thing in the Church, and having attained so little strength, was foredoomed to extinction.

What Gerard de Frachet really says is that the entire Order was relatively small and feeble, being then only in its beginnings; but in the same passage he intimates that there must have been a fairly large number of friars in the Bologna community, since 'many' of them contemplated leaving the Order. The passage, therefore, on which Echard relies, does not quite bear the weight of his thesis. This period of unrest and dejection followed St. Dominic's departure for Spain, and was of later date than the miracle at Mascarella; it occurred some time between Blessed

¹ Echard, *Scriptores Ord. Præd.*, i. 41; cf. Malvenda, *Annales Ord. Præd.*, ad an. 1220, n. 6.

² *Vitæ Fratrum*, ed. Reichert, p. 25.

Reginald's arrival in December, 1218, and the extraordinary influx of postulants whom Reginald's thrilling eloquence attracted to the ranks of the Order.

Echard, however, with his usual acumen, has drawn attention to the only serious flaw in the case for the Mascarella miracle. According to Primate Reginald's statement, reported in the *Vitæ Fratrum*, the miracle which he witnessed was performed on behalf of an 'immense multitude of friars' (*ingenti fratrum multitudini*), who were then in the Bologna community. The writer, no doubt, uses the language of hyperbole, but he clearly meant to convey the impression that the community was exceptionally large at the time. This was certainly not the case in 1218; on the occasion of St. Dominic's visit to the Mascarella convent, the total strength of the community, including the Saint and his travelling companions, probably fell short of twenty. A few months earlier the community had consisted of only six religious; and, though fresh recruits had entered, the total number was by no means large. The later dejection of spirit, to which Echard has somewhat inaccurately referred, is inconsistent with the fact of a numerous and rapidly growing community. Even in the wildest flight of imagination it would scarcely be possible to describe the Mascarella community, when the miracle described by Primate Reginald was performed, as 'an immense multitude of friars.' On the other hand, when Blessed Reginald's fervid preaching began to take effect, and when the brethren moved into the spacious convent of St. Nicholas, the community increased by leaps and bounds. From his arrival in Bologna until his departure for Paris—that is from December 21, 1218, until August, 1219—Blessed Reginald is recorded to have received the amazing number of over a hundred novices.¹ Here, then, as it would seem, was the 'immense multitude of friars,' on whose behalf the miracle recorded by Primate Reginald was performed.

This, no doubt, would be an ample vindication of

¹ Drane, p. 352.

Echard's theory ; but it would compel us to relegate the Mascarella, with its tables and paintings, and its age-long belief in St. Dominic's miracle, to the lumber-room of exploded traditions. We must either jettison the time-honoured traditions of the Mascarella, or else find some way of explaining the obviously hyperbolical expression, which Gerard de Frachet ascribes to Primate Reginald, concerning the 'immense multitude of friars.' Personally, I cannot bring myself to agree with Echard's opinion ; I regard the Mascarella traditions as too strong to be waived aside or lightly overthrown ; and I look upon Gerard de Frachet's hyperbolical phrase as suggested by later and remarkable developments. It is, in a word, the result of confusion based upon anachronism. Gerard de Frachet was an honest and worthy writer ; but he did not distinguish with sufficient care between the phenomenally flourishing community in the priory of St. Nicholas—of which he must have heard so many glowing accounts—and the relatively small and poverty-stricken community which existed in the Mascarella convent, some forty years before his time of writing. In all probability, he was at no minute pains to discover which priory had been the scene of Primate Reginald's miracle ; he recorded the salient facts, and added his own mistaken colouring. It is rather significant that Echard's theory, built upon Gerard's phrase, and hostile to the Mascarella tradition, has not found acceptance with such careful modern writers as Father Mortier and Miss Drane. It is pretty safe, therefore, to conclude that the miracle which Primate Reginald was privileged to witness in the days of his youthful fervour was none other than the miracle wrought by St. Dominic in the priory of the Mascarella.

M. H. MACINERNEY, O.P.

[To be continued.]

IRISHMEN AS TEACHERS IN AMERICA

By R. J. KELLY, K.C.

OUR countrymen seemed always destined, in every age, to be the teachers and instructors of other peoples. In the early ages Ireland rightly and rightfully gained for herself the proud distinction of being *par excellence* the chief country in Europe as an educating centre—*insula sanctorum et doctorum*. She only ceased to be the same active agent of knowledge in latter years when persecution and internal troubles kept her schools from flourishing, but never once, when occasion favoured and when peace at all settled down on the land, did she forget her old mission of apostleship, nor did her sons fail in or forget their peculiar aptitude for teaching and characteristic love of learning.

America owes much to Ireland. She supplied the early Colonists with teachers. Irish Catholic and Presbyterian went there to teach, opened schools, and but for them there would have been no popular education and a vast deal of illiteracy. Taney, the great American Chief Justice, and Daniel Webster, the great statesman and lexicographer, were, amongst others, taught by Irishmen; and we may take to ourselves the credit, and perhaps claim the merit, that but for Edward Evans, a Connaughtman, American literature would have lost Webster's contributions to it; and perhaps we should not have his great dictionary which, following the lines of Johnson's, did so much in that way for the English language. Until replaced by more modern and up-to-date books *Webster's Dictionary* was the standard authority, and still, edited by capable men, it holds high rank in the world of letters. Webster's schoolmaster being, as I said, an Irishman—and he having taught him that love of learning and liberty which that great orator

and statesman never lost, but showed on every occasion in so splendid a manner and with such enduring results—his fame may, in a degree, be fairly attributed to his Connaught preceptor and the early lessons taught by him.

A full and complete list of the Irishmen who, in the early days of the North American Colonies, were engaged in teaching there has not yet been published; and therefore only disconnected and discursive references occur in records and in biographies to them. Often there is no direct reference to their nationality, and we can only assume it from their names—such distinctively Irish names as Murphy and Kelly leaving us in no doubt on the point. It is to be hoped that some day a comprehensive account of America's debt to Ireland in this respect will be published, if only in justice to our countrymen and as a proof of what they did to build up that great Republic. To-day the Catholic Church of America numbers 16,067,985 members, according to the *Official Catholic Directory*, in this respect showing an increase in the year 1913 of 913,827 persons alone. There are in the United States 18,568 priests, of whom 4,868 are of the religious Orders mainly engaged in teaching. Of that grand army of missionaries probably seven-eighths are Irishmen, either directly born here, or the sons of native Irish. The great body of those regularly engaged in teaching are also largely made up of our countrymen, and so they, in their way, continue the old tradition and occupation of teaching.

Among the long roll of our countrymen, engaged in the early struggling years of the American Commonwealth in teaching, I can only mention a few to whom I found recent reference in an address delivered in America, and in other sources. The list is not complete or exhaustive. It only enumerates a few, but even these few names show what was done under great difficulties and many disadvantages. I do not mention the men I enumerate in the order of merit or time, but somewhat discursively, as the names occur in the papers I read. Probably I am omitting, unwittingly, some greater and better names, but the few honourable heroes in letters and pedagogy I particularise deserve the

distinction of a notice, however brief and passing ; and the fact of the mention may induce others to go farther and deeper into the matter and give us a complete list of those honourable men.

Francis Allison was known in the eighteenth century as 'the Schoolmaster of Pennsylvania,' a proud and honourable title, which he well deserved. He came from Donegal—from the wilds of that picturesque county which some of our English friends imagine is still given over to illiteracy and ignorance. Yet, in those dark days, it nourished Francis Allison, as in our days it did William Allingham. In 1741 Allison established a school in New London, in the great Quaker State, and he was known 'as the foremost scholar of his time.' So he is described, in no exaggerated eulogy, for the institution he started was so successful an educational establishment that it formed the foundation of the present distinguished Delaware College—a splendid institution, with a brilliant professorate, and turning out, and having turned out, for years some of the best men in literature and in politics. Three of the immortal names attached to the Declaration of Independence—the document that set the world astir and aflame with the principles of modern democracy—were pupils of Allison. He, later on, became head of the Academy, which grew into the College of Philadelphia, and ultimately became the University of Philadelphia.

The 'Irish settlement near Paston led to the foundation of Lafayette College, the first school of higher learning in that part of Pennsylvania ; and New Sweden (according to the historian Acrelius) scarcely knew what a school was until there came over from Ireland some Presbyterian and Catholic teachers who established "subscription schools" to teach children their letters.' The 'Irish Schoolmaster' proved the teacher of the wilderness. There is scarcely a town or county in the State of Pennsylvania that is unassociated with some Irishman as its teacher in its early struggling days.

Delaware and Maryland States' records tell the same story of Irish service. In 1755, alone, four Irish schoolmasters are mentioned in the annals of Newcastle County,

Delaware. John Hart, a native of the Co. Cavan, was one of the original founders of public education in Maryland, and many of the teachers were Irishmen. The great Chief Justice of America, Roger B. Taney—one of the ablest jurists of his day—was, as he gratefully mentions in his memoirs, one of Hart's pupils, and never forgot what he owed to him.

In Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia the records show, prominent among its teachers, men with distinctively Irish names. Robert Alexander, in 1749, founded Augusta Academy, which in course of time developed into the Washington and Lee University.

Archibald Murphy is mentioned in the history of that county as 'the father of North Carolina's common schools.' In his *History of Georgia*, Smith says that the the Colonists in the early days had no means of education provided, no schools or teachers 'save now and then a wandering Irishman.' In New Jersey, says Clayton, speaking of those early days, 'the earliest teachers were smart, passably educated, young Irishmen.'

A recent writer, speaking of the subject, says :—

From the year 1774, however, the trail of the Irish schoolmaster in the Colonial records becomes obscure. A hundred years had changed him into an American patriot. The shadow of the great war for the rights of man was already over the land. The *Iliad* and the *Tain* had given place to the musket and the drill manual; the teacher of 'the gentler Art of Learning' had become the adjutant or the clerk of the local military company. Up to this time the Town Clerk's meagre records of village education had bristled with Irishmen's names. Now these became equally conspicuous in the rosters of patriot militia.

Daniel Webster's first tutor was a Connaughtman, one Edward Evans, a native of Co. Sligo, who is described as a man with 'a smell of gunpowder' about him, as he had abandoned his school to join the patriot army at the opening of the Revolution. Many other eminent men of Colonial and revolutionary days were trained by these Irish schoolmasters of New England, the most famous of whom was the Dean of Derry, better known as Bishop Berkeley, who spent his early years in the Colonies.

Rhode Island College, now Brown University, acknowledges gratefully its debt to an Irish schoolmaster, one James M'Sparran, a Co. Derry man; and Guild's *History of Rhode Island College* says the first funds were raised in Ireland, and it mentions such Irish names as Kelly, O'Dwyer, M'Carthy, Reilly, Connor, and M'Cormack as teachers in the early years of that popular institution.

In 1718 there was in Hampton, New Hampshire, a schoolmaster appointed, and he is referred to in a contemporary record as successor to 'Ye late schoolmaster, Humphrey Sullivan.' In 1734 Edward FitzGerald was chosen to teach at Boscawen, New Hampshire, and 'Master O Nail' was appointed at Wear, New Hampshire, in 1792. He taught, we learn, 'on the strict moral suasion plan.' The names of *ten* Kellys appear among the list of teachers, in New Hampshire alone, before the close of the eighteenth century—a noble record for the name.

William Tennent, an Irishman, was a teacher in Pennsylvania, and in 1728 he established at Neshaminy, the 'Log College,' where, we learn, some of the most distinguished men of the Presbyterian Church in America were taught. It was described as the spiritual ancestor of Princeton University, where, during its career, so many Irishmen were teachers and where there are always to be found some of our countrymen since its foundation.

In 1686 Thomas Dongan opened a school at Lower Dublin, near the present site of William Penn's city, but the Quakers somewhat distrusted him, as his principles seemed too bellicose for their peaceful ways. A curious law was enforced in Philadelphia at the time. A tax of twenty shillings was imposed on 'Irish servants,' but forty shillings were put on Germans, differentiating in our favour to that extent. Bishop Berkeley was engaged in teaching in America before he settled down in his native county. He was born in Kilkenny and going to the North American Colonies founded there a college for the Indians, and it was while he was resident at Newport, Rhode Island, that he wrote *Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher*. Before he left America he gave Yale College his fine collection of books,

at his time the finest that was in that country. Both the great University of Yale and education generally in America owe a deep debt of gratitude to that great Irishman, and should hold his name in reverence, as they do.

The New York Directory of 1811 contains at least thirty-two names of Irishmen then engaged in school teaching. These figures and other evidences, such as that of the names, are in themselves, however, no true and absolute test of Irish nationality. Although leaving Ireland to settle in America and enjoy, it was thought, there that freedom of religion which was denied them at home, English persecuting laws followed them, for we find this obnoxious law, among others, prevailing and enforced in the Quaker State. It was enacted that all *Irishmen* should

go apparelled like Englishmen and wear their beards after the English manner, swear allegiance and *take English surnames*, which surnames shall be of one Town, as Sutton, Chester, Trim, etc., or Colours, as White, Black, Brown, Green, or Art or Science as Cook, Butler, etc.; and it is enacted that he and his issue shall use this name under pain of forfeiting his goods, etc.

It is little wonder that time-serving, politic, and timid Irishmen should, under such pressure, have abandoned the 'Mac' and 'O,' and their distinctive Irish names, and come to be known henceforth as Greens, Cooks, or such like English names, to win favour.

The Rev James Colgan, a Protestant, taught at Trinity Church Charity School from 1726 to 1731; and one Dr. Cochrane, an Irishman, was tutor of the eccentric and brilliant statesman, John Randolph.

The Colonial records of Maryland and Delaware speak of the Irishmen 'in peace teachers, in war soldiers'; and that was their record all through the ages, from the discovery of America by Columbus, with a Connaughtman among his crew, down to the present day. It is a record of brilliant service to be proud of—proud that such were our services to the great Republic which, more than any other nation, we helped to build up and will help to maintain.

R. J. KELLY.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

RECOVERY OF A GIFT—TRADING INTEREST

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly answer the following queries in I. E. RECORD and oblige :—

I°. A shopkeeper in a country village gives *as a present* to each of his customers at Christmas some such article as a pound of tea, a pair of slippers, or other commodity. The shopkeeper, however, recoups himself by charging the value of the article to the account of each customer, without their knowledge.

II°. A shopkeeper has been for years in the habit of adding five per cent. to all accounts lying unpaid for a considerable time (over a year) without mentioning the matter to any of his customers. There is nothing on the billheads of the firm to indicate that interest is charged on overdue accounts.

In each of the above cases has the shopkeeper violated strict justice?

P.P.

The shopkeeper has, in our opinion, in both cases, been guilty of a violation of strict justice.

I°. He either intended to make a gift or did not.

4°. If he did, the ownership of the article passed, and he cannot recover it :

1°. Because it is no longer his, and he has no more right to it than any other member of the community.

2°. Because, as regards both customers and other traders, he is inviting custom on false pretences.

3°. Because, in some places at all events, these Christmas presents are regarded as a matter of 'right,' not of generosity.

B°. If he did not intend to make a gift :

1°. The ownership did not pass, but

2°. The other considerations, already mentioned, hold good, and his policy is against justice.

II°. Interest is charged by most traders, as is evident from the fact that a discount is allowed for cash payment. What period does the discount cover? From our own experience we should say about one year. After that additional interest *might* be charged,

but only when there is a contract, express or tacit.¹ If the trader, without such contract, charges interest, he is guilty of injustice :

1°. Because, without any contract, he is assuming the rights that a contract would give.

2°. Because, again, he is prejudicing the rights of other traders who are decent enough not to charge interest when they do not state it. He is securing custom on false pretences, and must stand condemned in the court of conscience.

How far he may be excused by reason of ignorance, *bona fides*, etc., we may leave 'P.P.' to decide. The principles are known to every priest, and need no explanation. We are dealing, not with exceptional circumstances, but with the normal objective facts.

NOTE.—Another query has come regarding the obligations of a man who has subscribed to a society of public utility, and finds himself in a position to recoup himself privately. He has no right whatever to do so. Even subscribers to public funds are bound by the Seventh Commandment.

ADMINISTERING SACRAMENTS TO HERETICS. SOME RUBRICAL MATTERS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be very grateful if you would give me an answer to the following questions :—

I°. Certain well-intentioned Anglicans sometimes come to confession to a Catholic priest without being known to him. He, in order to prevent this filching of one of the Church's sacraments, forms a predominant intention *not* to absolve this class of penitent. Is this allowable or commendable ?

II°. The size of the Host used for Mass differs considerably in different churches. Is there any fixed *minimum* size below which it is unlawful to go ?

III°. Many strong things have been said lately about the moral duty of young men, who are free, joining the Army or Navy—some have even laid down an obligation in *justice*. What are the theological grounds for such doctrines in countries where there is no conscription ?

SACERDOS.

As for validity, the case seems clear enough. The predominant intention has its effect, and the penitent is not absolved.

I°. As for liceity, though, we think the confessor is not justified. The position, after all, of a man who uses the words of absolution and *actually* intends to confer no sacrament is practically the same as that of a man who, by a *general* intention, wishes, while pronouncing the words, to give no absolution. And we know what authorities think of the former case. Lehmkuhl, for instance, after citing various canonists and theologians, gives us the following

¹ Cf. Lehmkuhl, *Th. Mor.* (10th Edition), I., n. 1308.

statement: 'Fictio sacramenti est mendacium graviter nocivum, et est mendacium sacrilegum, cum ipsa re sacra, videlicet ritu sacro a Christo instituto, minister sacrilege abutatur tanquam medio mendacii proferendi.'¹

II°. There is no fixed size. It varies in different churches, and, in fact, in the same church. According to the rubrics, the Host for the Mass should be larger than the ordinary; there are many reasons for the regulation. But the law is not very strict. A smaller particle may be used. The authorities are agreed, and we need not quote them. But if one, of the first class, be asked for, we may give Lehmkuhl again: 'Etiam solius devotionis causa celebrari posse, quando magna hostia desit, cum hostia parva, i.e., ejus formae, quae pro usu populi adhibetur: si vero celebratur coram populo, eum ad tollendam admirationem de defectu occurrente monendum esse',² which last regulation is to be understood more or less strictly according to the circumstances.

III°. Kindly see the answer given below to 'A Confessor.'

CITATIONS FROM ROMAN LAW

REV. DEAR SIR,—In reply to a matrimonial case in a recent issue of the I. E. RECORD, you quoted a civil regulation, *Ea quae*, as if it settled everything. Do you mean to say that a paragraph of pagan law is to govern the *Tametsi* or *Ne Temere* decrees, or that the conscience of twentieth-century Catholics is to be governed by the laws of pagan emperors? The Church has always made her own laws; she has enforced them in spite of civil authority, and I look for very strong evidence, indeed, before admitting that she has ever adopted *in toto* the regulations of any civil authority.

LAICUS.

We had no intention whatever of saying that the Roman law, either in its entirety or in reference to the question of domicile, with which our correspondent is concerned, was ever canonized by the Church. We merely suggested, and we do so still, that the provisions of the Roman law—and of every civil law for that matter—may, when not in opposition to the natural or ecclesiastical law, be cited in connexion with problems for which the Church law gives no secure grounds for a definite solution.

On this special question of domicile we are aware, of course, that others take a different view. H. Gasparri, for instance, in a work entitled *De Domicilio et Quasi-domicilio* (n. 3) maintains that the texts of Roman law have been formally adopted by the Church, and that the Roman civil law has, in consequence, become ecclesiastical. With all deference to his acknowledged authority in these

¹ Ibid. II. p. 36, n. 61.

² Ibid. p. 95, n. 164.

matters, we are compelled to differ from him for the following reasons :—

1°. His one great proof is borrowed from the Constitution *Speculatores* of Pope Innocent XII—in reference to the domicile of candidates for ordination. He seems to find there a complete adoption of the principles of Roman civil law. But a close inspection of the document will show that his conclusions are quite unwarranted. The Pope makes no allusion to Roman law : *a fortiori* he gives no sanction, as some of his predecessors did,¹ to special regulations of the civil legislation. Not merely so. He contradicts the Roman law on essential points. He upholds a *domicilium originis* entirely distinct from the Roman *origo*. In case of the ‘accidentally’ born, he rejects the views of the best interpreters of the Roman law. And he imposes an oath that was quite foreign to the Roman law and the school of Accursius. All of which makes it perfectly plain that he was adopting neither the Roman law nor the commentaries of the jurists. He was establishing, as he very well might, a new law, more in harmony with the needs of practical life. We have treated of the matter already,² and we need not discuss it again.

2°. No Pope, General Council, or other authoritative tribunal, has ever sanctioned the Roman law as such.

3°. Civil laws, emanating from duly constituted authority, are, of course, binding. Both powers, ecclesiastical and civil,³ come from God, and claim dutiful submission. But, as compared with other civil regulations, the Roman law can claim no very special pre-eminence. It has been asserted that the Roman legislation was ‘favourable to the Church, inspired generally by the Catholic faith, sanctioned by Christian emperors, sometimes even formulated under the inspiration of Popes and Bishops.’⁴ That may be useful in oratorical disquisitions, but is hardly in harmony with historical facts. The Digest came from pagan jurisconsults; the imperial Constitutions, with the exception of one law from Constantine and two from Theodosius and Arcadius—none of these, by the way, introducing anything new on the question of domicile—all came from pagan emperors. Any claim that might be urged in favour of earlier legislation is sufficiently met by the fact that Raymond of Pennafort, acting under the orders of Pope Gregory IX, eliminated from the chapter *Intelleximus* of Lucius III the second word

¹ Cf. a letter of Gregory the Great, quoted by Gratian (c. 7, c., ii. q. 1).

² *Irish Theological Quarterly*, ‘Domicile: the Historical Development of the Idea.’ Jan., 1915.

³ Prob. vii. 15, 16; Rom. xiii. 1.

⁴ M. Deshayes, *Questions pratiques sur le Mariage*, p. 132, n. 2.

of the phrase, 'canonum priorum.' All of which tends to show that the special claims of the Roman law may easily be exaggerated.

4°. So much so, that the canonists were obliged to draw up a long list of cases, in which the Canon law found itself in hopeless disagreement with the civil legislation. We need only refer to the 'fifty points of disagreement between the two legislations' compiled by the famous canonist, Reiffenstuel.¹

We have, perhaps, granted more than our correspondent wished. But we do so gladly, for we had no idea of asserting what he gives us credit for. On some matters Canon law leaves us in doubt, and in regard to these, civil law—Roman or modern—may be called in to help us. May we quote instances? The famous law, *Barbarius*,² for example, governing the question of 'common error' in regard to jurisdiction. The use made of the same law by Sanchez.³ Or the decretal of Pope Gregory IX,⁴ which states: 'Quia vero, sicut leges non dedignantur sacros canones imitari, ita sacrorum statuta canonu 1 principum constitutionibus adjuvantur, fraternitati tue mandamus . . . negotium ipsum, secundum legum et canonum statuta non differas terminare.' Nicholas of Cusa stated that 'an ecclesiastical case should, in the absence of canonical regulations, be decided according to the civil law.'⁵ Fagnan, in his discussion on the chapter *Cum esses* (10, *de Test.*, iii. 26) sums up the views of his predecessors: 'Whenever there is a regulation of the civil law, not set aside expressly by Canon law, we should be on our guard against asserting a contradiction between the two: in fact, the civil law should be followed, even in ecclesiastical courts.'⁶ Some of the commentators go further still: so far, indeed, that, we think, no modern authority would follow them. According to one principle, cited by Fagnan, 'Without the (ecclesiastical) canons, a jurist is little; without the (civil) law, a canonist is nothing.'⁷

These citations will explain clearly enough the principles on which we relied. We made no claim that every section of Roman legislation might be regarded as Canon law. But we did suggest that, when Canon law left matters undecided, help might be secured from the civil law, especially when—as we found was the case in the matter submitted—the regulations of the civil law are quoted in the replies of Roman Congregations.

¹ *Jus Can. Universum*, T. i. p. 43.

² L. 3, D. i. xiv.

³ *De Matrimonio*, l. 3, d. 21, t. i., p. 232.

⁴ *Intelleximus*, i. v. 32.

⁵ Commentary on the title, *De Novi op. denunt.*, v. 32.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 'lex civilis servari debet etiam in fero ecclesiae.'

⁷ In cap., *Super specula*, 10, *Ne cler. vel mon.*, iii. i. t. 2, p. 685: 'Legista sine canonibus parum valet, canonista sine legibus nihil.'

CONSCRIPTION—OUR DUTY TO THE STATE

REV. DEAR SIR,—There has been much talk lately of our duty towards our country. In certain exalted quarters it has been given out that there is a duty incumbent on certain categories of the people of taking up arms for the defence of the realm. This duty, moreover, it is claimed, is binding, in virtue of the obligation of justice—legal justice no doubt. Now I should like to ask if there really is such a duty binding in conscience? Am I, in any circumstances whatever, bound in conscience to take up arms? Am I, in other words, ever bound to risk my life for the temporal interest of my neighbour or, indeed, of the whole community? Theologians seem to be agreed that, even in those States which have adopted conscription, the law of military service is no more than penal. Whence, then, comes this obligation binding in conscience? In spite of all that has been said about such an obligation, I should hesitate a long time before I should venture to warn a penitent that he was in peril of damnation unless he repaired at once to the recruiting office. Yet if there is such an obligation it must be a grave one, and so bind under mortal sin.

An explanation would just now be very opportune—at all events to enlighten

A CONFESSOR.

The query raises issues on which, in the present state of public opinion, we have no ambition to express an opinion. Rather than give no reply, however, we may—as our correspondent is English—quote an English magazine. The *Month*, 1915, p. 637, has the following :

On any sound conception of the relations between the citizen and the State, it may be the duty of the former on occasion, even a strict obligation in conscience, to take up arms in the latter's defence. And it belongs to the responsible authorities in the State to determine when the occasion for fulfilling that duty has arrived. Can we say that the present crisis is such an occasion? Those responsible in this country for the conduct of the war have made repeated appeals for more and yet more soldiers. The existence of the Empire is at stake, and all who owe that Empire allegiance should rally, according to their several capacities, to its support. Soldiers are the chief and most immediate need, and those who are eligible as regards age and physical fitness, and who have no other serious tie of duty or method of service comparable with this, are bound in conscience, if ordered so to do, to offer their services to the military authorities. Otherwise there is no meaning in citizenship. Many hold that, in the circumstances, it is within the right of the State to enforce enlistment by Act of Parliament. And should a selfish individualism, or real absence of the patriotic sense, operate to prevent recruiting on the requisite scale, a national levy is quite probable. In other words, the voluntary system itself, the glory of this free country, one of its main advantages over the regimented nations of the Continent, is now upon its trial. It would, we think, be a grave misfortune if it failed the test. To have to establish in these islands a system of universal and compulsory military service would be

to perpetuate the old barbaric notion that the State is primarily organised, not for peace but for war, and that warfare, actual or prospective, enters into the normal relations of sovereign peoples—the very notion to destroy which we are at this moment lavishly spilling our blood and treasure.

Will 'Clericus,' 'Tyneside,' 'Dubitans,' 'Sacerdos,' and others please take this as a reply. Without discussing principles more fully, we can assure 'Anglicus,' however, that he is quite justified in giving absolution in the circumstances he describes.

LAW OF FAST AND ABSTINENCE

REV. DEAR SIR,—A question arose amongst some priests during the Lent—whether those exempt from fast could eat meat as often as they please outside the principal meal at which it was allowed by the Lenten Indult?

A stated that 'persons exempt from fast, v.g., by reason of age, could eat meat *toties quoties* on fasting days when the Bishop in his Lenten Indult allows the use of meat at the principal meal, provided that he does not restrict its use to that meal in the case of those who are bound only to abstain.'

The following explanation of the principle was given, viz.: The persons in question are not restricted as to the number of meals—they are, however, bound by the law of abstinence, unless and in so far as the Bishop removes it by the Lenten Indult.

When the Bishop in the Lenten Indult permits the use of meat at the principal meal on certain days during Lent to the faithful of the diocese generally, and does not expressly or impliedly restrict its use to that meal in the case of those bound to abstain, he removes altogether on these days the abstinence from meat. And since the abstinence is so removed those exempt from fast can eat meat *toties quoties*.

B stated that he could not see how it followed that those exempt from fast could eat meat *toties quoties* on these days, even though the Indult had not imposed a restricting clause concerning them.

C stated that the Indult had nothing at all to say to the question.

As, sometimes, the principles regarding the ecclesiastical law of fast and abstinence are not stated with sufficient clearness and distinctness in the compendious treatises within the reach of priests in country missions, you will much oblige the undersigned and some others by saying if the principle stated by A, and the explanation given of it, be theologically correct.

A SUBSCRIBER.

We have received several other communications on this matter. They cover the same grounds practically: and our correspondents will kindly excuse us for not publishing all their letters.

We have every sympathy with 'Subscriber' in his difficulties, and in his dissatisfaction with the 'compendious treatises.' The principles given are not always clear or consistent, and, hence, it is not surprising that such difficulties arise.

One of the primary principles, for example, in the matter is, that the law of fast restricts the quantity, the law of abstinence the quality. But cases arise in which even this primary principle would seem, at least at first sight, to be challenged. Anticipating for the moment what we shall have to say later on, we may take the case of a man over twenty-one years of age and under sixty, not exempt from the law by reason of illness, labour, or other cause, but allowed by Lenten Indult to have meat at the principal meal. Outside the principal meal he is allowed only what custom sanctions; and, in these countries, custom certainly does not sanction meat. Let us suppose, then, that, while observing the law in regard to quantity, he takes meat at breakfast. What law does he violate—fast or abstinence? In the circumstances, as we shall see, the law of abstinence is generally removed. The sin, therefore, would be against the law of fast. And so we have a case in which, apparently at least, the law of fast governs the quality and not the quantity.

‘Subscriber’ makes no distinction between the different classes of persons exempt from the law of fast. In that he is correct enough, as recent replies have put them all on the same footing in this matter. But, in order to understand the Roman replies and to appreciate the development of ecclesiastical legislation, it is well to put them in two categories, (1) those excused by reason of age or labour, (2) those excused by reason of ill-health.

In regard to the former, a question was put to the Penitentiary: ‘Whether the faithful, exempt from the law of fast by reason of labour, may, during Lent, when the use of flesh and white meats is allowed to all at one meal, use flesh and white meats several times in the day, the same as on Sundays in Lent on which the fasting obligation does not bind?’¹ The reply, given on the 16th January, 1834, was that ‘the faithful, who by reason of age or labour, are not bound to fast, may lawfully, during Lent, when an Indult has been granted, use flesh and white meats allowed by the Indult, and on all days comprised in the Indult, as often as they please during the day.’² That settled their case once for all, and, except for a minor regulation to be mentioned later, has never been modified since.

¹ ‘Utrum fideles exempti a lege jejunii ob artes laboriosas, tempore Quadragesimæ, quum esus carnis et lacticiniorum omnibus ad unam refectioem permittitur, possint carnibus et lacticiniis vesci pluries in die, haud secus ac in Dominicis ejusdem Quadragesimæ, in quibus non urget obligatio jejunii.’

² ‘Fideles, qui ratione ætatis vel laboris jejunare non tenentur, licite posse in Quadragesima, quum indultum concessum est, omnibus diebus Indulto comprehensis vesci carnibus aut lacticiniis per idem indultum concessis quoties per diem edunt.’

Strange to say, in reference to the second class—those excused by reason of ill-health—the regulations for a time were much more strict. To the query: ‘Whether those excused from the fast by reason of ill-health are to be put on the same footing as those exempt by reason of age and labour . . . and may, therefore, use flesh meat several times in the day?’ the Penitentiary, on the 29th June, 1863, gave a negative reply.¹ It was evidently felt, however, that a reply of this kind was rather out of place in connexion with persons who might, on the recommendation of their medical adviser, use flesh meat even on days when the Lenten Indult did not allow it. And so, when the Bishop of Salford put the question again, he was told by the same Penitentiary, on the 16th March, 1882, that ‘the faithful who are exempted by reason of ill-health from the law of fast . . . may lawfully use meat, as often as they eat, on those days of Lent on which the use of meat is allowed by Indult.’²

In other words, all exempt from the law of fast—whether on account of labour, age, or sickness—are now in the same position. They may have, as often as they please, anything allowed at the principal meal by the Lenten Indult. We must say this appeared strange to us when we were told of it first; in our younger days we never heard of it, nor were we allowed to act on it. But it is the law.

With one important proviso, however. The Bishop removes the law of abstinence; he is not obliged to do so; he may do so in whole or in part. If he declares in his Lenten Indult, explicitly or implicitly, that the law of abstinence still binds those who are not obliged to fast, his word is law, and the regulations above mentioned are of no effect.³

As for the three theological authorities cited by ‘Subscriber,’ we may, therefore, dispose of them easily. B was too strict; C was wrong in saying that the Indult ‘had nothing at all to say to the question’; A, we believe, in view of the later replies, was quite correct.

Our remarks, all through, apply to persons exempted from the law, not to those dispensed. The latter are governed by special regulations.

¹ ‘Utrum iis, qui ratione aetatis et laboris jejunare non tenentur ac propterea toties quoties carne vesci diebus indulti possint, aequiperandi sint qui ratione infirmæ valetudinis a jejunio excusantur, adeo ut illis quoque pluries in die vesci carnes liceat.’ ‘Negative.’

² ‘Fideles qui ratione affectæ valetudinis a lege jejunii seu unice comestionis eximuntur, licite posse iis Quadragesimæ diebus, quibus esus carniû per indultum permissus est, toties carniû vesci, quoties per diem edunt.’

³ Penitentiary, 27th May, 1863. Cf. Lehmkuhl, *Th. Mor.* (10th ed.), i. p. 780; Génicot, i. p. 382; Noldin, ii. p. 711, etc.

THE NEEDS OF EMIGRANTS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Irish emigrants are now in the greatest danger. . . . Have any steps been taken by the authorities to meet the crisis ? . . .

A. M. W.

Even before the present crisis arose, the Bishops had attended to the matter. We need not quote all their pronouncements, but perhaps the following, passed at a general meeting of the Hierarchy in Maynooth College, in October, 1907, will come up to our correspondent's standard :—

RESOLVED—That from information they have received, the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland deem it their duty to warn Irish girls against allowing themselves to be induced by certain plausible advertisements which appear from time to time in Irish newspapers to go to Manchester or other large towns in England in the hope of obtaining situations under favourable terms in English houses.

We are assured that unprotected girls are exposed to the greatest dangers in many of those places, and not infrequently have been utterly ruined. They never should accept such situations nor answer such advertisements without consulting the local clergy, from whom they will obtain the necessary information and guidance.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

INTRODUCTION OF THE CAUSE OF THE IRISH MARTYRS

THE title of the recent decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, declaring that the Commission for the introduction of the cause of the Irish Martyrs had been signed by the Pope, begins with the words *Decretum Beatificationis*, and to this fact, no doubt, are mainly due the gross misconceptions of which the decree has been the subject. Those who do not read the decree very closely, or who are not very well acquainted with the procedure prescribed by Canon Law in Beatification and Canonization, would, naturally enough, from these words conclude that our Irish Martyrs were now beatified, and that the faithful were free to offer them public worship and the other honours to which the Saints are entitled. Although these misconceptions have been already publicly corrected, still it will not be inappropriate if, in this organ so widely read by the Irish clergy, we state precisely the stage which the present decree marks in the process of Beatification, and indicate some of the effects which it produces.

Although Bishops at the present time are incompetent to perform the whole process of Beatification, yet its initial stages are

still subject exclusively to episcopal authority. The preliminary proceedings in the diocesan courts are directed, in the case of martyrs, towards a twofold object. One preliminary investigation is called the *processus informativus de fama martyrii et miraculorum*, its object being to prove that there is a solid foundation for the opinion which exists regarding the martyrdom and miracles in question. For the Beatification of martyrs it should, however, be stated that miracles of the second class suffice, that no special number is prescribed, and that sometimes even the necessity of miracles is altogether dispensed with.

The object of the other preparatory process is to show that public worship has not been given to the reputed martyr, in accordance with the regulations made by Urban VIII on this matter.

Very often, however, these latter proceedings are not begun until the Commission for the introduction of the cause has been officially signed, and, of course, when this is the case they can be carried through only by Papal authority. As a matter of fact this seems to be the procedure which has been followed in the case of the Irish Martyrs, as in the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites we find reference only to the informative process regarding martyrdom and miracles.

When the proceedings in the episcopal curia have been completed, they are transmitted to Rome to the Congregation of Rites, usually by a messenger specially appointed for this purpose.

After having lain for a considerable period in the archives of the Congregation, and when new supplications for Beatification have been made by eminent persons, whether of the clergy or laity in the country to which the Servants of God belong, the acts of the diocesan court are opened at the request of the *Postulator*, who has been specially entrusted with the conduct of the whole case. The Holy Father then appoints a Cardinal who is to act as *Ponens* or *Relator* in the cause, and also interpreters to translate the various documents into Latin or Italian, if the informative processes have not been conducted in either of these languages.

After various other preliminary steps, into which it is quite unnecessary for us to enter, a day is finally appointed to discuss in an ordinary meeting of the Congregation the question whether the Commission for the introduction of the cause should be signed. Should the results of the deliberations be favourable, they are communicated by the Secretary to the Pope, and the latter then signs with his own hand the Commission by which the particular cause in question is formally entrusted to the Congregation of Rites.

Now, this is precisely the stage which has been reached in the case of our Irish Martyrs. The Pope has now formally committed

their cause for examination to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and hence really only the initial steps towards Beatification have as yet been taken. Before the decree of Beatification can be finally issued, elaborate proceedings must be gone through—first of all in this country by some Bishop appointed for this purpose by the Holy See, and afterwards in the Roman Curia itself. As the number of the Martyrs is so great, and as each individual case must be examined on its own merits, a considerable period must elapse before the aspirations of the Irish Church on this subject can be finally realised.

Whilst, then, the fact that the cause of the Irish Martyrs has been formally introduced affords a well-grounded hope that it will reach that consummation which is so ardently desired, yet it is grossly incorrect to regard this consummation as having been attained by the present decree.

Consequently, as yet it is unlawful to offer public worship to any of those heroes who so gloriously shed their blood for the Faith during the bitter persecution to which the Catholics of this country were subjected in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; in fact the payment of such worship at the present stage of the process would be quite destructive to their prospects of ultimate Beatification. On the other hand, however, there is no prohibition against the cultivation of private devotion towards these martyrs, even before their Beatification has finally taken place.

Formerly Servants of God whose cause had been introduced were entitled to be called Venerable. By a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites published in August, 1913, this privilege was withdrawn, and the solemn celebrations by which its concession was usually accompanied were forbidden; and, nowadays, martyrs acquire the right to this title only when the decision regarding their martyrdom has been finally issued.¹

Another effect produced by the introduction of the cause, which it may be well to recall, is that from this moment until the Beatification has been completed it becomes unlawful, without the *imprimatur* of the Congregation of Rites, to publish anything dealing in any way whatsoever with the cases under consideration.²

EFFECTS OF SUSPENSION FROM JURISDICTION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly let me know whether a suspended priest may still validly hear confessions. In the case of excommunication a distinction is made between *ex communicati tolerati* and *vitandi*, and in regard to *tolerati* it is laid down that they can validly,

¹ Vide *Acta Apost. Sedis*, vol. v. pp. 436 et seq.

² Const. *Officiorum et Munerum*, Rule 32.

and even in some cases lawfully, hear confessions. In any of the books at my disposal I can find no reference to a similar distinction or to similar teaching in the case of suspension. Would you be good enough to give me the benefit of your opinion on the point?

PRESBYTER.

Our correspondent's query evidently has reference only to suspension which extends to jurisdiction. If a priest is suspended merely from benefice or from Orders there can be no doubt whatsoever that he can validly hear confessions. Suspension from benefice has no effect upon Orders or jurisdiction, the powers brought to play in the hearing of confessions; and suspension from Orders, whilst it renders the use of Orders necessary for conferring the sacrament of Penance unlawful, does not affect its validity, as the Church or its ministers cannot take away this power once it has been really conferred. The question, then, resolves itself into this, whether suspension from jurisdiction takes away altogether this power, or merely renders its use unlawful.

Previous to the time of Martin V there is no doubt that jurisdiction was completely taken away both by excommunication and suspension. This is admitted by all canonists, and there are various texts of the Decretals to prove it.¹ At that period all censured persons were in the position in which *vitandi* are at the present time, that is to say, the faithful were under an obligation of avoiding communication or co-operation with them in those matters which came within the scope of the particular censure by which they were bound. It is true, indeed, that even at that time, if the excommunication or suspension were occult, jurisdiction would be supplied by the Church in consequence of the common error and coloured title which usually existed, but, *per se*, the effect of these censures was to remove this power altogether.

It is evident that this discipline was calculated to subject the faithful generally to serious inconveniences, and it was to diminish these inconveniences somewhat that the distinction between *tolerati* and *vitandi* was introduced by Martin V. The Constitution *Ad evitanda*, which embodies his legislation on this matter, makes it quite clear that the distinction applies not merely to excommunication but to all kinds of censures indiscriminately.² The condition required by

¹ Vide Suarez, *De Censuris*, Disp. xiv. Sectio i. n. 1 et seq.; also Disp. xxvi. Sectio 2, n. 2.

² 'Nemo deinceps a communione alicujus in sacramentorum administratione vel receptione aut aliis quibuscunque divinis vel extra illa, praetextu cujuscunque sententiae aut censurae ecclesiasticae a jure vel ab homine generaliter promulgatae, teneatur abstinere vel aliquem vitare ac interdictum ecclesiasticum observare, nisi sententia vel censura hujusmodi fuerit in vel contra personam, collegium, universitatem, Ecclesiam, communitatem a judice publicata vel denunciata specialiter et expresse.'—Constit. *Ad evitanda*.

the decree in order that a person be regarded as a *vitandus* is that the censure which he has incurred be specially and expressly published or denounced by an ecclesiastical judge—‘a iudice publicata vel denunciata specialiter et expresse.’ Hence, in the case of sentence censures the sentence alone of the judge does not suffice, it is necessary that it be afterwards published; in the case of *ipso facto* censures, besides publication and prior to it a declaratory sentence is required. All others, whose censures are not thus denounced, are regarded as *tolerati*.

The primary difference between *vitandi* and *tolerati* and the only one expressly mentioned in the Constitution is that communication with the former is strictly forbidden to the faithful, whereas with the latter it is freely permitted.

From this primary difference many others may be deduced; we, however, are concerned only with one special effect which is produced in the case of suspension from jurisdiction. Canonists who discuss this point are unanimous in saying that whilst jurisdiction is taken away altogether from *suspensi vitandi*, *tolerati* are, on the other hand, only deprived of its lawful use.¹ The reason given for this distinction is that the permission granted to the faithful of freely communicating and co-operating with *tolerati* in the exercise of jurisdiction would be meaningless, unless this power remained. In fact, a further consequence of this permission is that jurisdiction may be even licitly exercised whenever its exercise is requested by the faithful.

Our direct response, then, to ‘Presbyter’s’ query is that a suspended priest, if he is a *vitandus*, cannot validly hear confessions; if, however, he is a *toleratus* he can always validly administer the sacrament of Penance, but not, however, lawfully unless his ministrations are asked by the faithful.

TESTIMONIAL LETTERS FOR ORDINATION

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be obliged if you would kindly give me your opinion on the following points regarding the testimonial letters required for Ordination:—

1. Are these letters required from all the Bishops in whose dioceses the candidate for Orders has lived for a considerable time? Authors hold that they are, though I can find no justification for this view in the Bull *Speculatores* upon which the whole discipline on this matter seems to be based.

2. What is the precise period of residence for which testimonials are required?

¹ Suarez, l.c.; Palmieri-Ballerini, *Op. Th. Mor.*, vol. vii. n. 505.

‘Scilicet ut iam diximus de excommunicato tolerato, jurisdictio suspensio tolerato non aufertur, sed prohibetur uti non rogatus vel citra necessitatem.’—Bucceroni, *Commentarius* ii. *De Censuris*, n. 118.

3. What age must the subject of ordination have attained before his residence in an outside diocese renders him subject to this regulation?
VICARIUS.

1. It is true, indeed, that the Bull *Speculatores* is not as explicit on this point as one could desire. It expressly prescribes that testimonial letters should be obtained from the Bishop of the place where the candidate for Orders was accidentally born if he had lived there for such a length of time that he could have contracted a canonical impediment:—

Quod si quis tanto temporis spatio in eo loco in quo ex accidente, sicut praemittitur, natus est, moram traxerit ut potuerit ibidem canonico aliquo impedimento irretiri, tunc etiam ab Ordinario ejus loci litteras testimoniales, ut supra, obtinere illasque episcopo ordinanti per eum in collatorum ordinum testimonio similiter recensendas praesentare teneatur.

For a long time it was very keenly controverted whether the same disposition should be applied to residence in other dioceses, apart from the one in which the *ordinandus* was accidentally born. Many canonists held the negative opinion, for the reason that this disposition, being a restriction of human liberty, should not be extended beyond the limits expressly contemplated in the law itself. Besides, they considered that it would be too serious an inconvenience to require testimonials from the Bishops of all the dioceses in which the subject of ordination may have resided at various times.¹ Its advocates were also able to point to many decisions of the Roman Congregations favourable to this view.²

The affirmative opinion was, however, the one commonly held, even prior to the publication of the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis*. It was contended that the circumstance of birth mentioned in the law was purely accidental, and that the point mainly emphasized, and the one which gave its *rationale* to the whole disposition, was the fact of residence for such a length of time that an impediment could be contracted. Consequently it was concluded that the law extended to residence in any diocese whatsoever.³ Nor were there wanting positive decisions, which seemed to lend official sanction to this opinion also.⁴

¹ Vide Gasparri, *De Sacra Ordinatione*, n. 729; Riganti, *In Reg. Cancell. Ap.*, n. 31, etc.

² S.C.C. in Bosanensi, 17 Mar. 1708: '8. An subditi episcopi Bosanensis tam ratione domicilii, quam ratione originis, qui ratione studiorum moras traxerunt in civitate Saxonensi, potuerint ad ordines promoveri ab eodem episcopo sine testimonialibus archiepiscopi?' 'Ad 8^{am}. Affirmative.'

S.C.C. in Algareni, 3 Aug. 1709, etc.

³ Vide Gasparri, l.c.

⁴ S.C.C. in Asculana, 7 Febr. 1733; in Bononien., 14 Nov. 1733; in Fabrianen., 19 Aug. 1797, etc.

Since the publication of the *Apostolicae Sedis*, however, there can be no doubt that testimonial letters are required from every Bishop in whose diocese the *ordinandus* has spent such a period of time that he could have contracted a canonical impediment. The following suspension contained in the Constitution clearly demonstrates this: 'Suspensionem per annum ab ordinum administratione ipso jure incurrunt ordinantes . . . vel etiam subditum proprium qui alibi tanto tempore moratus sit, ut canonicum impedimentum contrahere ibi potuerit, absque Ordinarii ejus loci litteris testimonialibus.'

2. As is evident from what has been already said, testimonial letters are required after residence in a diocese for such a length of time that a canonical impediment could have been contracted. Here there is no question of strict philosophical possibility—strictly speaking, such an impediment could be contracted in the very shortest time. There is question merely of juridical possibility, that is to say, of the period within which, morally speaking, a canonical impediment is likely to be contracted. This can be determined only by reference to the common estimation of canonists and the common practice of episcopal curias in this matter. Nowadays opinion and practice are unanimous in requiring a residence of at least six months, in ordinary cases, before admitting the necessity of testimonial letters. In the case, however, of those engaged in military service there is express legislation to the effect that these letters are required after a residence of three months.¹

3. From the laws which impose the obligation of obtaining testimonial letters, already referred to, we may deduce that the age at which this regulation begins to bind is the age at which a person becomes capable of contracting a canonical impediment. All are agreed that these laws have no reference to residence which takes place prior to the age of seven. It is also agreed that for residence which takes place after the age of puberty has been attained, testimonial letters are required. It is very much disputed, however, whether they are required for residence during the period intervening between seven and fourteen.

For an adequate discussion of this point it would be necessary to enter into the whole vexed question of how far *impuberes* are subject to censures and irregularities *ex delicto*—a question which, to our mind, cannot be settled with certainty on the existing data. For our present purpose it will be sufficient to indicate briefly a few of the reasons for the opinion which denies that *impuberes* are

¹ S.C. Super Disciplina Regulari, 27 Nov. 1892; S.C.C. 9 Sept. 1893: 'Litteras testimoniales esse necessarias, quoties promovendus moratus fuerit in aliqua dioecesi saltem per trimestre.'

bound by this regulation regarding testimonial letters, and which, if not speculatively certain, is at least sufficiently probable to be safely followed in practice.¹

In the first place, even though it be granted that, absolutely speaking, *impuberes* may incur *ipso facto* censures and irregularities *ex delicto*—and, of course, many deny this—still they so rarely have that amount of malice which is necessary for the commission of the serious crimes, to which these punishments and quasi-punishments are attached, that there exists a juridical impossibility for them to contract these canonical impediments to ordination, and it is of juridical possibility and impossibility that there is question evidently in this law; and hence the conclusion follows that they are not included within its scope.

The practice of many episcopal curias is also appealed to in support of this view. Even on the admission of its opponents, e.g., Gasparri, the French curias are unanimous in not requiring testimonials for residence which has taken place before the age of puberty has been attained. In regard to the Roman Vicariate, there is a difference of opinion; it seems more likely, however, that its practice is the same as that of the French curias.

This opinion receives a certain amount of confirmation, also, from analogy with the prescription of Pius IX regarding the testimonial letters required by those about to enter religion. In the Constitution *Romani Pontifices*, in which these prescriptions are contained, it is laid down that these letters are required only for residence which has taken place after the age of fifteen has been reached.

J. KINANE.

¹ Vide Wernz, *Jus Decret.*, Tom. iii. n. 29; Many, *De Sacra Ordinatione*, n. 123.

LITURGY

RELICS OF A PORTABLE ALTAR DISTURBED: DOES IT LOSE ITS CONSECRATION? MASS ON AN ALTAR STONE IN WHICH THERE ARE NO RELICS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Your opinion on the following queries is respectfully requested. 1°. When the *opertorium* of the sepulchre and the relics in a portable altar stone are not *removed*, but accidentally slip out, and are put back again, and the cement which gave way made secure—does the altar stone lose its consecration? 2°. I have heard it stated that the Bishops of this country in the past had the privilege of consecrating altars without relics, just as at present, by the *Formula sexta*, they can allow the use of such altars. If, then, a priest cannot, *sine gravi incommodo*, get recently consecrated ones, can he continue to use the ones that have for a long time been in use, even though there is no trace that relics had at any time been inserted?

SACERDOS.

1. The Congregation of Rites has over and over again made it clear that any violation of the sepulchre of an altar, whether fixed or portable, involves the loss of consecration.

A certain Bishop, having noticed that the cement around the *operculum* of a fixed altar had become loose, ‘ipse ut rem melius exploraret, lapidem ipsum manu sua movit, et cum reipsa solutus esset de situ, sublevavit; Reliquias tamen nullo modo tetigit vel dimovit; deinde reposuit.’ He asked the Congregation whether, in consequence, the altar had lost its consecration; or whether it would not be sufficient to close the sepulchre again and cement it properly. The reply¹ was: ‘Altare, de quo in precibus, nova consecratione indigere.’

A similar answer was given a few years later (1875) to the Abbot of Mount Melleray. The Sacristan discovered that the cement had given way, and had it renewed. The relics, however, had been in no way interfered with. A doubt arose subsequently as to whether the consecration had been lost and the reply² was given: ‘Si sepulcrum apertum non sit, sed tantummodo novo caemento firmatum, *Negative*; si secus, *Affirmative*.’

Though these instances refer to fixed altars it is laid down by all writers that, similarly, any violation of the sepulchre of a portable altar will result in the loss of consecration. Thus Lehmkuhl³ states that *any* altar (*altare quodlibet*) loses its consecration ‘fractione sigilli, i.e., illius lapilli seu operculi, quo sepulcrum reliquiarum

¹ Decr. Auth. 3106, Mar. 14, 1861.

³ Vol. ii. 308, 1910 Edition.

² Decr. Auth. 3379.

tegitur; aut etiam sola hujus sepulcri aperitione, quae fit removendo operculum, etsi statim reponitur et clauditur.' And Van der Stappen,¹ dealing expressly with the case of a portable altar, states that the consecration is lost: 'Si amotum fuit operculum a sepulcro; etiamsi Reliquiae nullo modo fuissent dimotae, et operculum mox fuisset repositum.' Indeed, there is an answer² of the Congregation to the effect that, in the case of a portable altar also, consecration is lost 'etiam solummodo si hoc (sc. operculum) amotum fuerit.'

These instances, we think, clearly show that in the case mentioned by our correspondent the altar stone has lost its consecration. Such would be the case, in our opinion, even if the *operculum* only had fallen out, while the relics remained undisturbed. For the sepulchre was opened, it does not matter how. If even a Bishop is not allowed to open the sepulchre, *a fortiori* the consecration is lost when the opening has been effected by any other agency. But something more occurred. The relics also fell out of the sepulchre and were thus, for a time at least, separated from the altar stone which, therefore, lost its consecration. The mere restoration of the relics is not sufficient to reconsecrate it.

2. We cannot say whether the Bishops of Ireland ever received such a privilege. But we think it very probable that they did not. For the faculties they possessed by the *Formula sexta* were amply sufficient to meet all necessities in this matter. At the present time, as in the past, they may allow priests to celebrate Mass 'super altari portabili etiam fracto aut laeso et sine Sanctorum reliquiis . . . si aliter celebrari non possit.' And, speaking under correction, we would say that this permission is granted as a matter of course to all priests on the mission, just as the permission is granted 'celebrandi bis in die si necessitas cogat.' We take it that as the latter privilege is included, without any special mention, when a priest receives 'the ordinary faculties of the diocese,' so the former is included also. If this opinion be correct our correspondent need have no difficulty in celebrating Mass on an altar stone without relics until he can procure one which is properly consecrated. We know that in many churches altar stones are still used which have no sepulchre at all, and therefore never had any relics. This is quite intelligible on the supposition that the permission which the Bishops may give, in virtue of the *Formula sexta*, is taken for granted. But if our correspondent has any scruples on the point he may easily satisfy himself by consulting his Bishop.

¹ Vol. iii. Q. 40.

² Decr. Auth. 2991.

PRIVATE MASS IN A CONVENT CHAPEL ON HOLY SATURDAY

REV. DEAR SIR,—I shall be obliged to you for a solution of the following questions in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD :—

1. It is stated in the rubric given in the *Ordo* for Holy Thursday and the two following days that private Masses are forbidden on these days? What is 'private' in the rubric opposed to?

2. By what right are private Masses celebrated in convent oratories for nuns on the above-mentioned days?

3. If it is by virtue of an Apostolic privilege should not the Litanies and Prophecies be omitted when celebrating a private Mass on Holy Saturday?

SUBSCRIBER.

1. A 'private' Mass is sometimes taken to mean a Mass which is not sung; that is, one which is not a Solemn Mass or a *Missa Cantata*. More frequently the term 'private' is opposed to 'public,' and a private Mass is one which is not said for some community and is not of obligation. But in connexion with the last three days of Holy Week the term has a peculiar signification, for we find it applied in the decrees even to a parochial Mass, when the special functions of Holy Thursday or Holy Saturday are omitted. A private Mass then, according to the special rubric referred to, is one which is said when the special ecclesiastical functions of the day are not carried out, even according to the *Memoriale Rituum*.

2. Private Masses, in this sense, are forbidden by the general law of the Church on the last days of Holy Week. The law affects parochial churches as well as convent oratories and if a parish priest wishes to celebrate such a Mass in his church on Holy Thursday he must obtain annually the permission of the Bishop. On Holy Saturday the celebration of private Masses is absolutely forbidden in all churches and oratories. In the case of convents, Mass—even along with the other functions according to the *Memoriale Rituum*—cannot be celebrated on these days without a special Apostolic indult. Much more is an indult required in order that Mass may be celebrated without the ceremonies. Indeed, permission to celebrate a private Mass on these days is regarded by the decrees as something very special and unusual.

3. Such permission is, however, sometimes granted. And the very question raised by our correspondent in his third query was proposed to the Congregation of Rites more than once :—

Q. An in Sabbato Sancto missa ab Episcopo privatim celebranda in domestico sacello ratione Ordinationis, vel ab aliis sacerdotibus (siqui sunt) qui huiusmodi privilegio gaudeant, inchoanda sit a *Kyrie* vel a *Prophetiis*?

R. Quoad Episcopos, ratione Ordinationis servetur praescriptum Pontificalis et Decretum S. C. diei 21 Martii 1744 in Bergomensi, et

missa incipiatur a Prophetiis; et quoad alios, si qui privilegio gaudent, more solito, sed sine Introitu, post Campanarum sonitum.¹

A later answer² is in the same sense. It was asked: 'An hujusmodi missis privatis praemittenda sit lectio Prophetiarum et Litaniarum; an vero ipsae incipiendae sint ab Introitu? R. Iuxta idem Decretum (2616) more solito, sed sine Introitu post Psalmum: *Judica me Deus* et Confessionem.' In other words, the Mass is begun and said as given in the Missal for Holy Saturday.

The Litanies and all the previous ceremonies are, therefore, to be omitted in such a case. It will be noted that in the first of the replies quoted the words 'post campanarum sonitum' are added. A private Mass should not begin until the bells of the principal church announce that the Paschal solemnities have commenced. The reason is suggested by Gardellini³ in the following words: 'Etenim, posito privilegio, haud eo uti licet, nisi postquam nuntiatum fuerit, per festivum campanarum sonitum, Ecclesiam, deposito luctu, per laetitiae signa Festis Paschalibus signum dedisse.'

We have written all this on the supposition that the convents in question have the privilege of a 'private' Mass on these days. But we may perhaps be pardoned for expressing a doubt as to whether such a privilege really exists. It is quite possible that an abuse has crept in and that the other functions are omitted without due warrant.

THE EJACULATION 'MY LORD AND MY GOD' DURING THE ELEVATION; MAY THE INDULGENCE BE GAINED BY THE CELEBRANT? IS HE ALLOWED TO UTTER PIOUS ASPIRATIONS AFTER HIS COMMUNION?

REV. DEAR SIR,—1. On May 18, 1907, Pope Pius X granted an indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines to *all* the faithful who look at the Host at the moment of elevation and say: *My Lord and my God!* Can the celebrant of the Mass gain this indulgence by saying the same words?

2. Is it allowable for the priest after Communion to say in a low voice some pious aspirations such as, *My God and my all?*

P.P.

1. The rubric of the Missal says that the priest 'elevat in altum Hostiam, et intentis in eam oculis . . . populo reverenter ostendit adorandum.' And the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* similarly directs the celebrant to so elevate the Host 'ut ab omnibus videri possit.' It is plainly the intention of the Church that the members of the congregation should fix their eyes upon the Host when It is elevated by the celebrant. Notwithstanding this an almost universal

¹ Decr. 2616 ad 2.

² Ibid. 2970, ad 4.

³ Ibid. vol. iv. p. 216.

custom to the contrary prevails among the people, and mothers often teach their children not to dare to look upon the Host at the moment of elevation. A priest belonging to the Congregation of the Mission regarded this custom as a relic of Jansenism and, with a view to eradicating it, asked the Pope to grant the indulgence referred to. This, of itself, goes to show that the indulgence is intended for those who assist at Mass, and not for the celebrant. The general wording of the rescript leads to the same conclusion. The indulgence is granted 'ad augendam *fidelium* devotionem et venerationem erga divinissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum.' It is granted on condition that they look at the Host during the elevation—the priest is already bound by the rubric to do so. And a plenary indulgence may be gained once a week by those who 'talem piissimam praxim quotidie peregerint, et sacram Communionem, rite dispositi, receperint.' Such expressions naturally refer to the faithful assisting at Mass as distinct from the celebrant.

But whatever may be said of the validity of this line of argument the view we have put forward is certain for another reason. The celebrant, as we shall presently see, is not allowed to utter ejaculations or prayers of his own during the elevation, or indeed at any other time during the Mass. This brings us to the second query proposed by our correspondent.

2. During the celebration of Mass the celebrant is to confine himself strictly to what is contained in the Missal. He is not permitted to change, curtail, or add anything. The Congregation of Rites declared¹: '*nihil omnino* mutandum, adimendum vel *addendum* . . . ex his quae in Missali ordinario tam in rubricis quam in nigro praescribuntur, et multo minus in Canone.' St. Alphonsus² holds that to add a *Pater* or *Ave* 'ex importuna devotione' would be a venial sin. And Lehmkühl³ writes of ejaculations:—

Devotionis causa per modum suspirii oratiunculam jaculatorium a sacerdote celebrante interponi, quando propter actiones a prosequendis liturgicis precibus impediatur—ut in elevatione, post sacrarum specierum sumptionem, vel dum finem cantus exspectat—minus quidem convenire videtur, ita ut praestet, sola mente affectus divinos ciere, attamen pro peccato, etiam veniali tantum, id ducere non possumus.

We are inclined to think that, in view of the declaration of the Congregation of Rites, his condemnation might have been a little more emphatic.

THOMAS O'DOHERTY.

¹ Decr. Auth., n. 194. The italics are ours.

² Lib. vi. n. 411.

³ Vol. ii. n. 332.

DOCUMENTS

DECREE CONCERNING THE NATURE OF THE APPROVAL GRANTED TO OFFICES IN PARTICULAR CALENDARS

(November 28, 1914)

[The Sacred Congregation states that in granting this approval it by no means wishes to dispose of disputed historical questions arising in the Lives of the Saints commemorated in particular Calendars.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

DECRETUM

DE VI ADPROBATIONIS OFFICIORUM QUAE IN PROPRIIS PARTICULARIBUS
INSCRIBUNTUR

Quum Rm̃i Ordinarii locorum et Moderatores Ordinum Regularium aliorumque Institutorum, obtenta adprobatione respectivi Kalendarii proprii vel Variationum seu Additionum particularium, ad normam decreti generalis S. R. C. diei 28 octobris 1913, etiam Propria Officiorum reformata ipsimet sacrae Congregationi examinanda et adprobanda subiecerint, sacra eadem Congregatio, pro Officiorum Propriis iam adprobatis vel in posterum adprobandis, necessarium et opportunum declarare censuit, prouti expresse declarat: Per huiusmodi adprobationem, praesertim Lectionum secundi nocturni, nullo modo intelligi ac dici posse diremptas quaestiones historicas circa res gestas, in eisdem Propriis et Lectionibus commemoratas, ac potissimum circa Sanctorum vel Beatorum, maxime antiquioris aevi, monachatum eorumque pertinentiam ad unum vel aliam Ordinem. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 28 novembris 1914.

SCIPIO CARD. TECCHI, *Propraefectus*.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, Ep. Charystien., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

CERTAIN DOUBTS REGARDING THE RUBRICS OF PARTICULAR
OFFICES AND MASSES SOLVED BY THE CONGREGATION OF
RITES

(December 11, 1914)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM
SAGIEN.

DUBIA

Hodiernus Episcopus Sagen. a sacra Rituum Congregatione humillime postulavit sequentem dubiorum solutionem; nempe:

I. Utrum, quando ob occursum festi Duplicis I classis, officium alicuius Summi Pontificis vel Doctoris Ecclesiae perpetuo vel etiam accidentaliter simplificatur ita ut tantum in Laudibus commemoratio fiat de eo, usurpandae sint pro hac commemoratione Antiphonae magis propriae de secundis Vesperis *Dum esset* vel *O Doctor*, an potius Antiphona communior *Euge, serve bone*?

II. Utrum deinceps omittendae sint, tum commemoratio Omnium Ss. Apostolorum in officio Ss. Petri et Pauli (29 iun.), tum commemoratio Omnium Ss. Martyrum in officio S. Stephani Protomartyris (26 dec.) quum in novo Kalendario proprio dioecesis Sagiensis non fiat mentio harum commemorationum?

III. Utrum in Officio Dominicae anticipatae ad horas minores adhibenda sint capitula et responsoria Dominicae?

IV. Utrum omnia *Initia* Epistolarum S. Pauli debeant quotannis recitari, etiam quando prorsus omittuntur, ante Septuagesimam, officia Dominicarum IV, V et VI post Epiphaniam?

V. Utrum, in Missa feriali quae coram Ss^{mo} Sacramento celebratur, debeat omitti Oratio *Fidelium*, etiam quando a Rubrica praescribitur in Feria secunda vel in prima die libera mensis?

VI. Utrum, in festo Omnium Ss. Episcoporum et aliorum Sanctorum dioecesis Sagiensis, color paramentorum sacrorum debeat esse *Albus* an potius *Rubeus* quia aliqui horum Sanctorum sunt Martyres?

VII. Utrum uti liceat novis Officiis communibus plurium Confessorum Pontificum et non Pontificum, et plurium Virginum et non Virginum, non tantum in festis particularibus, sed etiam in festis Ecclesiae universalis, nempe Ss. Cyrilli et Methodii, Ss. Septem Fundatorum Ordinis Serv. B. M. V. et Ss. Perpetuae et Felicitatis?

Et sacra eadem Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, propositis dubiis ita respondendum censuit:

Ad I. Negative ad primam partem: affirmative ad secundam, iuxta editionem typicam Breviarii Romani.

Ad II. Standum Kalendario approbato.

Ad III. Provisum in Rubricis novissimis Breviarii Romani.

Ad IV. Negative iuxta Rubricas.

Ad V. Negative.

Ad VI. Servetur in casu consuetudo.

Ad VII. Negative, etiam attentis decretis 22 maii et 7 augusti 1914, ad III.

Atque ita rescipsit. Die 11 decembris 1914.

SCIPIO CARD. TECCHI, *Pro-Praefectus*.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, Ep. Charystien., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

APPROVAL OF LESSONS FOR FEASTS OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH WHICH IN SOME PLACES ARE ONLY COMMEMORATED

(June 24, 1914)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

DECRETUM

ADPROBATIONIS LECTIONUM PRO FESTIS UNIVERSALIS ECCLESIAE QUAE ALICUBI COMMEMORATIONE TANTUM GAUDENT

Quum Festa Ecclesiae universalis saepe saepius ob occurrentiam sive perpetuam sive accidentalem cum Festo seu Officio nobiliori alicuius particularis ecclesiae ita maneant impedita, ut tantum Commemoratione atque unica Lectione gaudeant, sacra Rituum Congregatio variis Ordinariorum petitionibus satisfactura, ad trames decreti 25 maii 1904 ad IV, de Festis seu Officiis enunciatis unicum Lectionem, ut plurimum ex tribus contractam, redigendam curavit, eamque revisam ac rite probatam, prout res postulabat, benigne concessit. Ex hisce singulis lectionibus praesens collectio exorta est, quam, de mandato Ssmi Dñi nostri Pii Papae X, ipsa sacra Congregatio pro rei necessitate et opportunitate in vulgus edi statuit ac decrevit; eademque Lectiones iuxta Rubricas adhiberi posse ac debere declaravit. Praesens autem decretum approbationis et concessionis pro utroque clero aliisque, quatenus opus sit, sacra eadem Congregatio huic collectioni praefigi voluit ac iussit. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscunque.

Die 24 iunii 1914.

FR. S. CARD. MARTINELLI, *Praefectus*.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, Ep. Charystien., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

THE FACULTIES OF PRIESTS ATTACHED TO THE ARMY OF HEARING CONFESSIONS DURING THE WAR

(March 11, 1915)

[By this decree all priests accompanying the army during the War, though not army-chaplains, enjoy the faculties already granted to chaplains (December 18, 1914), viz., of hearing the confessions

of all who approach them in the tribunal of Penance. These priests, however, should previously have received faculties of hearing confessions and the faculties should not have been positively withdrawn.]

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

DE SACERDOTIBUS NON CAPPELLANIS AD EXERCITUM PERTINENTIBUS
QUOAD FACULTATEM EXCIPIENDI CONFESSIONES FIDELIUM
DURANTE BELLO.

Post promulgationem decreti dati die 18 decembris 1914 de cappellanis militum quoad facultatem ad excipiendas sacramentales fidelium confessiones durante bello, propositum est huic S. Poenitentiariae sequens dubium :

‘An sacerdotes qui quovis titulo ad exercitum pertineant, possint, durante bello, dum exercitum comitantur, uti facultatibus omnibus, quibus ex decreto S. Poenitentiariae dato die 18 decembris 1914 fruuntur cappellani militum?’

Eadem vero sacra Poenitentiaria, mature consideratis expositis, benigne sic annuente sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papa XV respondendum esse decrevit :

‘Affirmative, dummodo sacerdotes, de quibus agitur, vel a proprio vel ab alio Ordinario confessiones fidelium excipiendi facultatem antea acceperint, quae positive revocata non fuerit.’

Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, in sacra Poenitentiaria, die 11 martii 1915.

S. CARD. VANNUTELLI, *Maior Poenit.*

I. PALICA, *S.P. Secretarius.*

L. ✠ S.

DOUBTS REGARDING THE PRAYERS OF A CERTAIN MASS
AND THE ORDER OF PRECEDENCE IN THE DISTRIBUTION
OF HOLY COMMUNION

(January 30, 1915)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

ROMANA

DUBIA

A sacra Rituum Congregatione sequentium dubiorum solutio reverenter expostulata fuit ; nimirum :

I. Si Festum Circumcisionis D. N. I. C. sit titolare alicuius Ecclesiae vel Instituti et recolendum sub ritu duplici primae classis cum octava, diebus 2, 3 et 4 ianuarii in quibus fit de die infra octavam cum secunda oratione de simplici ; et die 7 ianuarii in qua

agitur de secunda die infra octavam Epiphaniae cum commemoratione de octava Circumcisionis, quatenus erit tertia oratio dicenda in Missa ?

II. Rituale Romanum, edit. typ., tit. IV, cap. II, ubi describitur ordo administrandi sacram communionem communicandis tam extra missam quam ante vel post ipsam, atque etiam intra Missam, ad n. 11 haec habet : 'Sacerdos porrigit communicandis Eucharistiam incipiens a ministris altaris, si velint communicare.' Item in decreto n. 1074, *Galliarum*, 13 iulii 1658, in proposito dubio : 'An in communionem intra missam prius ministrandum sit Ssmum Eucharistiae sacramentum ministro missae inservienti quam monialibus vel ceteris ibidem praesentibus ?' S. R. C. responderi mandavit : 'In casu praedicto ministrum sacrificii non ratione praeeminentiae, sed ministerii, praefendum esse ceteris quamvis dignioribus.'

Unde quaeritur : 'An vox minister altaris vel sacrificii in his et similibus documentis S. R. C. restringenda sit exclusive ad ministros iam in ordinibus minoribus constitutos vel saltem tonsuratos, an potius voce ministri intelligendi sint omnes quicumque seu laici seu clerici qui missae inserviunt ?'

Et sacra eadem Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, omnibus sedulo perpensis, enunciatis quaestionibus ita respondendum censuit :

Ad I. In casu, tertia oratio erit de Spiritu Sancto.

Ad II. Nomine ministri altaris vel sacrificii missae venit quilibet clericus vel laicus, missae ad altare inserviens, qui praefendus est ceteris in distributione sacrae Synaxeos ; cauto tamen, ut laico inservienti praeferantur clerici, et clericis minoris ordinis alii in maiori ordine constituti, aut personae quae superiori polleant dignitate liturgice attendenda per se (uti regum) vel per accidens (uti sponsores in missa pro benedicendis nuptiis).

Atque ita rescripsit ac declaravit. Die 30 ianuarii 1915.

SCIPIO CARD. TECCHI, S. R. C. *Pro-Praefectus*.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, Ep. Charystien., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

ALLOCUTION OF THE HOLY FATHER AT THE CONSISTORY OF JANUARY 22, 1915

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV

ALLOCUTIO

HABITA IN CONSISTORIO DIEI 22 IANUARIi 1915

VENERABILES FRATRES

Convocare vos hodierno die visum est Nobis ob eam causam, ut de supplendo episcoporum ordine sollemniter coram vobis age-

remus. Complures enim ex orbe catholico ecclesiae sunt proximo tempore suis viduae pastoribus; in iis autem nonnullae reperiuntur, quibus, pro ipsarum dignitate, in hoc amplissimo coetu consulere aequum putamus.

Antea vero, cum frequentes vos hic adesse conspiciamus, venerabiles Fratres, qui propter singularem, quam habetis Nobiscum coniunctionem, omnium cogitationum curarumque Nostrarum estis iure participes, temperare Nobis non possumus, quin de illa aegritudine animi, qua Nos opprimi intelligitis, aliquid aliud in animos vestros effundamus. Scilicet menses continuantur mensibus, necdum spes ulla ostenditur fore, ut calamitosissima haec dimicatio, vel potius trucidatio brevi conquiescat. Cuius tanti mali si non, ut vellemus, properare finem possumus, utinam Nobis liceat dolores, qui ex eo consequuntur, mitigare. Equidem ad eam rem hucusque, quantum erat in Nobis, laboravimus; item, quoad res postulaverit, laborare non desistemus.

Hoc amplius conari in praesens officii Nostri conscientia prohibemur. Romani quidem Pontificis, ut qui constitutus a Deo sit summus legis aeternae interpret et vindex, maxime est edicere nemini unquam ulla ex causa fas esse violare iustitiam; id quod Nos apertissime edicimus, quaslibet iuris violationes, ubicumque demum factae sint, magnopere reprobantes. At vero ipsis bellantium contentionibus pontificiam miscere auctoritatem hoc sane neque conveniens foret, nec utile. Profecto quisquis est prudens rerum aestimator, videt Apostolicam Sedem in hoc certamine, quamvis sine maxima cura esse non possit, tamen nullius partis esse debere: cum Pontifex romanus, ut vicem quidem gerens Iesu Christi, qui pro universis et singulis hominibus mortuus est, omnes quotquot dimicant, debeat sua caritate complecti; ut Parens autem catholici nominis, utrobique filios habeat frequentissimos, de quorum omnium salute aequae debet esse sollicitus. Non igitur in eis respiciat oportet rationes ipsorum proprias, quibus inter se dividuntur, sed commune vinculum Fidei, quo copulantur. Si secus faciat, non modo causam pacis nihil adiuvet, sed etiam, quaesita in Religionem invidia, ipsam domesticam Ecclesiae tranquillitatem et concordiam magnis perturbationibus obiiciat.

Verum, neutris addicti partibus, utraque tamen, ut diximus, habemus Nobis curae; atque horridos huius belli motus summa sollicitudine atque anxietate prosequimur, praesertim cum timendum sit, ne forte vis inferendae impetus omnem quandoque modum excedat. Utique natura fit, ut ubicumque filiorum in communem Ecclesiae Parentem pietas fuerit exploratio, illic studiosior quodammodo eius mens animusque versetur: cuius rei, quod, exempli causa, ad dilectam Belgarum gentem attinet, argumento sunt eae

quoque litterae, quas haud ita pridem ad Cardinalem Archiepiscopum Mechliniensem dedimus.

Liceat hoc loco eorum, qui in alienos fines pugnando transierint, obtestari humanitatem, ne iis regionibus plus vastationis inferatur, quam ad easdem occupandas necesse sit; neve, quod maius est, incolarum animi in iis quae habent carissima, ut aedes sacras, ut sacrorum administros, ut iura religionis et Fidei, gratuito vulnerentur. Iis vero, quorum terras hostis occupavit, facile existimamus, quam durum sit externis esse subiectos. Sed caveant velimus, ne, prae libertatis recuperandae studio, gubernationem praesertim ordinis publici impediendo, suam conditionem faciant multo deteriorem.

Ceterum, venerabiles Fratres, tantarum premente mole miseriarum, non succumbendum est animo; sed, quo rerum obscurior videtur exitus, eo vel maiore *adeamus cum fiducia ad thronum gratiae ut misericordiam consequamur, et gratiam inveniamus in auxilio opportuno* (Hebr. iv. 16). Insistendum nimirum, uti iam diximus, humilibus ad Deum precibus, qui sicut humanarum rerum est dominator et arbiter, sic voluntates hominum deducere, unde velit, et quo velit, impellere unus invicta virtute potest. Neque enim sine nutu permissuque divino pax dicenda est tamquam evolasse ex orbe terrarum; scilicet, ut gentes humanae, quae suas omnes curas defixissent in terras, oblivionem neglectumque Dei mutuis caedibus inter se vindicarent.—Accedunt identidem alia rerum eventa, quae homines cogant ‘humiliari sub potenti manu Dei’ (1 Petr. v. 6); cuius generis id quod proximis diebus evenit, scimus omnes quam horrendum fuerit et quam luctuosum.

Iam vero, quoniam deprecatio communis acceptior Deo est ac fructuosior, bonos, quotquot sunt, exhortamur, ne desinant quidem apud se quisque divinam implorare clementiam, sed potissime id faciant, publicas in sacris aedibus preces frequentando. Nos autem propterea ut uno eodemque tempore quam maximus concentus comprecantium exsistat, duas, ut nostis sollemnes supplicationes indiximus, unam Europae catholicae in diem septimum mensis proximi, alteram catholico orbi reliquo in diem vicesimum primum mensis martii. Primae supplicationi Nosmet ipsi ad sancti Petri in Vaticano interesse constituimus; nec dubitamus quin vos ibidem, venerabiles Fratres, Nobiscum adfuturi sitis.

Faveat communibus Ecclesiae votis, adiutrix christianorum sanctissima Deipara, et sui patrocinii suffragio impetret a Filio, ut, mentibus ad veritatis lumen, animis ad iustitiae cultum revocatis, pax Christi revisat orbem terrarum, atque constanter posthac cum hominibus permaneat.

Sed iam ad episcoporum cooptationem deveniamus.

TWO DECISIONS *RE* THE PRESUMPTION OF DEATH IN
MATRIMONIAL CASES

(December 18, 1914)

[The cases illustrate the nature of the evidence demanded by the Congregation of the Sacraments to establish 'a presumption of death' in matrimonial cases and the freedom of the appealing party to contract a new marriage.]

S. CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM

PRAESUMPTAE MORTIS CONIUGIS

In comitiis generalibus habitis ab Eñis ac Rñis PP. Cardinalibus huius S. Congregationis die 28 novembris et die 18 decembris 1914 propositae fuerunt duae quaestiones *praesumptae mortis coniugis*.

I

Species facti. Mulier A. C. anno 1868 in quadam Americae paroecia nupsit in facie Ecclesiae viro M. V. Iste, anno sequenti, acceptis a quadam femina litteris, instanter rogavit uxorem ut cum ipso transmigraret in urbem S. Ibi vir uxori sub iuramento aperuit se iam cum alia muliere matrimonio esse copulatum. Tunc ipsam reliquit, promittens tamen se esse rediturum; sed, brevi spatio temporis elapso, litteris ei in perpetuum valedixit.

Derelicta mulier interim agnovit virum sub ficto nomine novas nuptias alibi attentasse, et ex illo tempore alteri viro adhaesit: ex huiusmodi concubinato plures procreati sunt liberi.

Nunc vero ambo conscientiae stimulis exagitati enixe orant ut sibi liceat matrimonii sacramentum celebrare. Praetermissa enim quaestione de nullitate matrimonii mulieris A. C. cum viro M. V. ex capite impedimenti ligaminis (quia factum antecedentis matrimonii fulcitur tantummodo attestazione viri M. V.) oratoribus persuasum est praedictum virum M. V. iampridem e vivis decessisse. Eandem gratiam effusis lacrimis efflagitant eorum filiae, ut tandem aliquando monasterium ingredi possint, unde eas hactenus arcuiturpis parentum conditio.

Argumenta. Ex multis peractis investigationibus haec in favorem praedicti obitus habentur rationum momenta.

In primis argumentum sat probabile mortis viri M. V. eruitur ex diuturnitate temporis elapsi. Matrimonium celebratum fuit anno 1868; hinc elapsi sunt 46 anni quin ulla de ipso habeatur notitia licet investigationes peractae sint in dissitis locis in quibus ipse commoratus est. Nunc aetatem supra septuagenariam ipse attigisset; quod improbable apparet inspectis speciatim pravis eiusdem moribus.

Nec deest argumentum positivum, iurata scilicet depositio filii quem oratrix e marito suscepit et post ipsius fugam in lucem edidit.

Cum ipse patrem suum olim perquireret in urbe C., a certo quodam P. R. didicit illum esse mortuum et quidem in urbe T. Ibi a quadam T. V., persona uti apparet fide digna, audivit patrem suum, aliquot mensibus ante, in navicula ad balneum exiisse, sed haud amplius visum fuisse : *era entrato, en verba depositionis, in un canotto a bagnarsi e non era più riapparso* ; solas ipsius repertas fuisse vestes : *solamente avevano trovato i panni sopra il ponte*, uti idem filius alia occasione addidit. Nominati tamen testes P. R. et T. V. non amplius in respectivis illis locis inveniuntur, nec scitur eorumdem actualis residentia, proinde citari non potuerunt.

Ceterum idem filius deponit se per biennium alias adhuc inquisitiones instituisse quoad existentiam patris, sed incassum.

II

Species facti. Mulier A. G. anno 1881 in urbe T. nupsit cuidam D. M. tunc aetatis 22 annorum : sed eum, utpote vino ac adulterinis amoribus deditum (uti ipsa asserit), post octo annos vitae communis deseruit.

Ille autem, sub finem anni 1889, trans mare in urbem B. se contulit, neque ullum umquam de se nuntium misit.

Interim uxor alii viro se adiunxit, quocum vitam concubinariam ducit.

Tandem, aeternae suae saluti consulere percupiens, casum auctoritati ecclesiasticae exposuit. Haec S. Congregatio Curiae dioeceseos mandavit, ut processum de praesumpto obitu coniugis D. M. instrueret ad tramitem Instructionis S. C. S. Off., anni 1868.

Absoluto demum processu, praefata Curia quum propria auctoritate sententiam ferre non auderet, illius Acta ad H. S. C. transmisit pro opportuna decisione.

Argumenta. Ante omnia advertendum est, oratricem in praesenti casu omnem effugere suspicionem mendacii. Nam ecclesiastica eius unionis sanatio nullum ipsi commodum temporale afferet.

Nam teste sacerdote regulari P. S., qui laudabili zelo eius causam pro viribus promovit : ‘ Omnes incolae loci ubi mulier habitat eam putant legitimo matrimonio copulatam . . . , omnes quibus nota est eam pro vera uxore semper habuerunt, ac etiamnum habent.’

Ad demonstrandam autem mortem eius mariti, argumenta effertur tam *negativa* quam *positiva*.

Prioris generis sunt : diuturnitas temporis ex quo vir disparuit et inutilitas indagationum :

(1) *Diuturnitas disparitionis :* Vir assertive defunctus patriam

liquit a viginti quinque circiter annis: 'Mense octobri anni 1889 navem conscendit in isto portu T., . . . mense vero decembri eiusdem anni appulit ad portum B.'

Ad tam diuturnam absentiam eo magis attendi debet, quod eius regionis incolae etsi numerosi in illam terrae partem emigrant, ibi tamen non ultra duos vel tres annos remanere solent, et postea in patriam revertuntur.

(2) *Inutilitas indagationum*: scilicet inde ab annis 1900 et 1901 vir ille exquisitus est ubicumque supponi poterat ipsius praesentia, idque ope 'consulum' respectivae nationis in longinquis illis regionibus residentium: at nusquam detectum fuit illius vel vestigium.

Posterioris autem generis argumenta sunt testimonia tum *de visu*, tum *de auditu*, tum *de fama*.

1. Testis *de visu* comparuit quidam B. C. 'homo—uti asseritur—probus, fide dignus, irreprehensibilis.' Qui, praevis obstrictus iureiurando, coram tribunali eccl. T., 4 mart. 1912, deposuit: *se maritum oratricis vidisse mortuum*.

Et quidem narrat: qua *occasione* mortuum viderit, quo *tempore*, quo *loco*, quae mortis fuerit *causa*, demum quomodo certus sit de *identitate* eiusdem, quem vidit, mortui cum marito oratricis.

Qua *occasione*: 'Hoc didici in urbe B. (in quam videlicet vir emigravit) ab aliquibus hominibus gentis meae: qui, cum de morbo tunc in illa urbe grassante loquerentur, praeter alias victimas nominarunt etiam certum quemdam D. M., cuius cadaver ego (postea) vidi.'

Quo *tempore* et *loco*: 'Id, ait, evenit anno 1897, mense aprili, in urbe B., in regione quam habitant nautae nationis meae, et quae vocatur B., prope ad mare.'

Quae fuerit *causa* mortis: 'Pestis illa erat febris typhoidea.'

Quomodo certus sit de viri *identitate*: De ea certus est:

(a) *ex relatione aliorum*, siquidem, iuxta ipsius verba modo relata, illi homines 'praeter alias victimas, nominarunt etiam certum D. M.': quod est nomen viri, de quo agitur.

(b) *ex propria recognitione*: vivum enim optime noverat: facile ergo mortuum agnovit.

Vivum optime noverat: 'Ego virum D. M. noveram inde ab annis 1884-85 in urbe T.'

Facile igitur agnovit mortuum: 'Eum recognovi ex vultu, speciatim ex maculis quas ibidem reliquerat morbus *variola*; erat staturae mediae, tunc forte annum agebat circiter trigesimum quartum.'

Hinc de asserta morte se *omnino certum* dicit: 'Ego *omnino certus* sum de morte D. M., ita ut hanc secundum omnem scientiam et conscientiam iurare possim; et attestor me, dum haec depono, nihil aliud spectare quam manifestationem solius veritatis.'

II. Testes *de auditu* acciti sunt quatuor :

(1) *Primus* P. I., 30 dec. 1909, sub religione iurisiurandi deposuit : ‘ Quatuor vel quinque abhinc annis audiui *a pluribus* ab urbe B. (in quam vir emigraverat) huc reversis, praefatum D. M. mortuum fuisse pluribus annis ante.’ Notetur concordantia temporis mortis indicati ab hoc teste et a praecedenti ; qui asseruit se mortui cadaver vidisse ‘ anno 1897.’

(2) *Secundus*, A. G., frater oratricis, qui dicitur esse ‘ irreprehensibilis, honestus, verax,’ bis, annis 1909 et 1912, coram iudice ecclesiastico sub vinculo iuramenti auditus est. Qui narrat, *ubi, quando, a quibus* mortem praefati mariti *didicerit*, et *ubi ipsa evenerit*.

Ubi et quando didicerit : ‘ Eram in urbe B. (etiam a duobus prioribus testibus designata) abhinc annos fere quindecim . . . Audiui loqui eo tempore de D. M. cum essem in loco quodam publico.’

A quibus dederit : praefatam mortem audivit tum a quodam F. L., homine eiusdem nationis ac vir de quo agitur, tum ab eius uxore, tum ab aliis, quibus ille notus fuerat et qui in illam urbem navigaverant vel illic commorabantur.

Ubi mors evenerit : audivit ex ea muliere, D. M. mortuum esse ‘ extra urbem B.,’ in quam procul dubio eius cadaver reportatum fuit, siquidem illud ibi agnovit supra citatus testis de visu.

(3) *Tertia*, E. B. ex eadem urbe B. ad quamdam amicam scribens, huic, inter alia, obitum nuntiat viri de quo in casu : ‘ Denique tandem—ait—certior facta sum de morte mariti Antoniae.’

Scripta fuit haec epistola die 2 sept. anno 1898 : ergo nonnisi sexdecim circiter mensibus *post* tempus mortis, quale indicavit supranominatus testis B. C. Congruunt proinde verba huius testis E. B. : ‘ Denique tandem certior facta sum. . . ’

Ceterum haec epistola in authentico exemplari Actis alligata est.

(4) *Quartus*, M. M., qui plures annos in illa regione moratus est, ubi mortuus asseritur vir, de quo in casu. Ignoratur quidem praesens huius testis domicilium, sed ‘ plures testes etiam sub iuramento affirmant, hunc M. M. mortem (olim) narrasse vir D. M.’

III. Testes *de fama*. De qua supra nominatus sac. reg. P. S. haec testatur : ‘ Publica opinio constans, diuturna ac longe pateque diffusa non parum ponderis habet : atqui talis est haec opinio de morte viri D. M. : *ita quidem ut ii, quibus nota est oratrix, semper crediderint et adhuc credant, eam esse legitimo matrimonio iunctam* : siquidem iis persuasum est, eam, post mortem prioris mariti, nupsisse in facie Ecclesiae.

‘ Plurimi sunt homines eiusdem gentis qui in eadem regionem emigrant. Qui tamen non solent uxores ac liberos illuc secum ducere, sed vadunt ut per duos vel tres annos illic laborent, et tunc

redeant : *Si ergo falsa fuisset publica haec opinio, facile corrigi potuisset : at nullus umquam auditus est nuntius contrarius, nulla nec suscipio.*

Contra allata argumenta inducitur exceptio quod mortis D. M. nulla mentio habeatur nec in libris parochialibus, nec in registis civilibus. Sed competens auctoritas illius loci, requisita a Curia episcopali quae processum confecit, ita rescribit 'accidere potuit quod, grassante illa pestilentia, propter nimium laborem illa mors non fuerit libris inscripta, aut notata fuerit sine nomine. *Huiusmodi omissiones tunc temporis fuerunt frequentes.*'

Pro utroque casu exposito sequens eminentissimis Patribus submissum fuit dubium : *An oratrici permitti possit transitus ad alteras nuptias.*

Et eminentissimi Patres omnibus mature perpensis pro utroque casu respondendum censuerunt : *Affirmative.*

✠ ALOISIUS CAPOTOSTI, Ep. Thermen. *Secretarius.*

DECREE REGARDING THE INTERRUPTION OF THEIR STUDIES BY RELIGIOUS NOVICES

(March 1, 1915)

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS

DUBIA

CIRCA INTERRUPTIONEM STUDIORUM

Huic sacrae Congregationi de Religiosis propositae fuerunt quaestiones :

I. Cum haud raro contingat, ut Religiosi studentes, absque ulla ipsorum aut superiorum culpa, per plures menses studia interrompere cogantur (ex. gr. infirmitatis, aut servitii militaris causa), quaeritur utrum huiusmodi studentes totum annum scholarem sic interruptum seu abbreviatum repetere teneantur ; an a Superiore generali, accedente voto deliberativo suorum Consiliariorum, dispensari possint.

II. Utrum examen seu periculum de quo in Responso ad n. VI Declarationum sacrae Congregationis diei 7 septembris 1909 sermo est, subiri debeat etiam ab alumnis, qui aliquam disciplinam accessoriam Theologiae in scholis non excoluerint ; et si affirmative, utrum hoc examen tam ab istis alumnis quam ab aliis subeundum, coincidere possit cum examine in fine anni scholaris subiri solito.

Quibus quaestionibus, in Congregatione generali diei 8 ianuarii 1915, Eñi Patres responderunt :

Ad I Negative ad 1^{am} partem ; affirmative ad 2^{am}, dummodo (1) interruptio seu compendium studiorum complexive non dura-

verit ultra tres menses; (2) studia omissa scholis privatis suppleta fuerint; (3) et in examine constiterit, ex testimonio examinerum seu doctrinae iudicium, alumnos disciplinas, de quibus in eorum absentia in scholis actum est, prorsus didicisse.

Ad II Examen, de quibus in Responso ad num. VI Declarationum sacrae Congregationis diei 7 sept. 1909 agitur, requiri pro qualibet disciplina omissa, sufficere tamen examen ordinarium etiam in fine anni praestitum, quod ex testimonio examinerum seu doctrinae iudicium constare debet.

Et sanctissimus Dominus noster Benedictus XV in audientia diei 2 ianuarii 1915, infrascripto Secretario benigne concessa, has responsiones approbare et confirmare dignatus est. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria S. Congregationis de Religiosis, die 1 martii 1915.

O. CARD. CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO, *Praefectus*.

✠ ADULPHUS, Episcopus Canopitan., *Secretarius*.

**DECREE OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF STUDIES IN
REFERENCE TO THE STATUTES OF THE ROMAN ACADEMY
OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS**

(March 12, 1915)

SACRA STUDIORUM CONGREGATIO

ACADEMIAE ROMANAE S. THOMAE AQUINATIS

STATUTA

IOUSSU SSMI D. N. BENEDICTI PP. XV RETRACTATA

EX MOTU PROPRIO 'NON MULTO POST' DIEI XXI DECEMBRIS MCMXIV

I. Romana S. Thomae Aquinatis Academia eo spectat, ut Angelici Doctoris philosophiam illustret, defendat ac tueatur. Ser-mone utitur latino. Praesident ei tres S. R. E. Cardinales; quorum Cardinalis Praefectus *pro tempore* sacri consilii studiis regundis prior loco est: adsunt a secretis seu a commentariis adiutor unus cum duobus subadiuvis; quibus munus mandatur in triennium, mandatumque iterari licebit. Complectitur Academia magistros, sodales et alumnos; alumni autem doctoris conferre lauream, eosque doctores renunciatos sodalibus adgregare potest.

II. Magistri minimum semel in unaquaque anni academici hebdomade S. Thomae libros de rebus philosophiae praelegant, praesertim utrosque Commentarios in Aristotelem et in Boethium: disputationes alumnorum, quae et ipsae hebdomadales in altera anni scholastici parte debent esse, moderentur: et una cum sodalibus, quid quisque alumnorum in doctrinae experimentis meritis sit, iudicabunt.

III. Alumni adsciscantur spei bonae adolescentes, qui cum in

philosophiae studio ordinarium trium annorum spatium confecerim, sacrae theologiae dent operam *textum* adhibentes ipsam Summam S. Thomae. Iique in statis disputationibus syllogisticis, quae quidem tum de thesibus, quas sacrum consilium studiis regundis die xxvii iulii mcmxiv approbavit, tum de aliis fient, quas quotannis Eñi Praesides, cum magistris Academiae convenientes, praescripserint, *vel defendentium vel arguentium* partes agant. Singulis autem mensibus unus e magistris itemque e sodalibus aliquam philosophiae scriptionem recitabunt.

IV. Alumnus qui doctoris lauream in philosophia S. Thomae expetat, ad periculum doctrinae et scripto et voce faciendum de quolibet capite philosophiae, quae vel in speculatione veri vel in moribus versetur, ne admittatur, nisi minimum biennio praelectiones disputationesque frequentaverit, ac duas ex his disputationibus feliciter habuerit.

V. Qui doctoris in philosophia lauream consecutus est, si evadere velit sodalis Academiae adgregatus, praelectionibus et disputationibus interesse alterum biennium pergat, ac publice propugnationem universae Aquinatis philosophiae suscipiat agatque cum laude.

VI. Candidato res successerit satis, si duas tertias punctorum partes tulerit. Examinatores seu doctrinae iudices, quibus suffragiis ius est, sive magistri sive sodales, ab Eñmo primo Praeside deligantur; et ii quidem ne minus quam tres unquam sint: ac tum ad probandum tum ad improbandum terna singuli habeant puncta, secreto attribuenda. Qui est a commentariis Academiae, itemque duo qui infra eum sunt, nisi examinerum officio fungantur, suffragium non habent: verumtamen unus eorum candidatis examinandis semper adsit, qui rei exitum adnotabit.

VII. Sub finem anni academici, proposito ab Eñis praesidibus argumento, certamen doctrinae scribendo fiet. Scriptionum ii erunt iudices, quos Academia designaverit. Quod si plures idem mereri videantur, non partitum praemium, sed integrum singuli obtinebunt.

VIII. Certum quoque praemium tum magistris et sodalibus vel pro praelectionibus quas habuerint, vel pro scriptionibus quas confecerint, vel prout coetibus adfuerint, tum etiam alumni, pro disputationibus quas sive defendendo sive arguendo participaverint, tribuetur. Huiusmodi autem praemia, itemque ceteras omnes impensas quotannis faciendas, Eñi Praesides definient; ii vero qui sunt a commentariis Academiae, Praesidibus postea rationem reddent.

Datum ex S. Congregatione Studiorum, die 12 martii 1915.

B. CARD. LORENZELLI, *Praefectus*.

A. DANDINI, *Secretarius*.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND. By John Lingard, D.D., and Hilaire Belloc, B.A. With an Introduction by His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons. Vol. XI. London : Sands & Co. ; New York : Catholic Publication Society of America, 1915.

IN the volume under review, being the continuation to our own day of Lingard's famous *History*, Mr. Hilaire Belloc has found an opportunity for the display of those singular powers of analysis which have won him fame in other fields. The period dealt with stretches from the fall of James II to the death of Edward VII. At the present moment the understanding of this period is of vital importance in grasping the development of the domestic and foreign policies of the British Empire.

It is a period marked, save for one notable exception, by singular success for Britain's policy at home and abroad. In the opening years of this period, as Mr. Belloc lucidly explains, England was developing that form of aristocratic Government under a constitutional monarch, which, suiting, as it did, the spirit of the age, ensured her her unique position in Europe. It is in the establishment of this aristocratic oligarchy that Mr. Belloc finds at once the strength and weakness of English Rule. Such an aristocracy, he points out, 'while it is in its prime, can defend the State, and co-ordinate all its interests and can suddenly summon up its resources against a foreign menace as cannot a democracy or a monarchy.' The strength of the English aristocracy lay in its power to represent and answer to the vital needs of its own people. It was recruited from the people and was the very opposite of a caste. Its failure lies, however, in its inability to *incorporate* alien things : 'it cannot govern imperially ; it cannot diffuse itself as an influence, at once masterful, creative and permanent, throughout the world.' It was, as Mr. Belloc says, the attempt made by the English governing oligarchy to incorporate the Irish nation, that led to its failure. It stuck to its hopeless policy for two centuries, and that policy has only ceased with that disappearance of oligarchic Government in England which is the central feature in the domestic and political life of the present time. Save in its failure to deal with Ireland

and in its failure to deal with the American Colonists, the period is a glorious one in the History of England and of Great Britain. It began with the successful carrying out of the French policy of William III, the destruction of the French power in India, the establishment of the Indian Empire, the growth of Britain's naval supremacy, and the establishment of England's industrial power. For Irish Catholics, however, it was a period of misrule and of bigoted persecution, but a period to which they may look back as one marked by the finest spiritual victory ever gained by any race on earth. They have emerged from it materially weakened, it is true, but endowed with a spiritual strength, which it is to be hoped will give them a unique place in the new world that is now opening before them. The appearance of this particular volume, by Mr. Belloc, is peculiarly opportune now. No finer moment could have been selected for its appearance. In his last chapter on the reign of King Edward VII, we have a lucid explanation of the changes in English foreign policy which have led up to the present situation

Briefly [he says], the revolution in British foreign policy which marked the reign was a change from a reliance upon the new German Empire and from a suspicion of, often an antagonism against, the Russian Empire and the French Republic, to a reliance upon the latter two, and particularly upon the French, as a counterweight to the sudden growth of the German fleet. It is not possible to mark the steps whereby this transformation was effected, for it has been carefully kept out of public documents, but the general process may be thus described. Just before King Edward came to the throne a German naval programme, designed in 1900, but intended to be spread over a long seventeen years, proposed the construction of a great fleet. That proposal was not yet one menacing to British naval supremacy. But with every year that passed, the determination of the German Empire to create a fleet that should be at least the second in the world, was more and more apparent. Programmes were accelerated, expenditure perpetually exceeded ordinary estimates, and, what perhaps alarmed British opinion more than the actual number of the German naval units, a very determined and successful effort was initiated to ensure perfect efficiency at sea. It is probable that this feature was exaggerated by the alarmed opinion of this country. The German authorities were characteristically slow in taking up any new invention (notably the submarine) and their fleet, like so many other of their modern developments, was untested. But, coupled with the very rapid industrial and commercial expansion of Germany, the appearance of the new Empire as a great naval power disturbed to their foundations the old postulates of British foreign policy. In the year 1903, two years after King Edward's accession, Great Britain was spending nearly four times as much as Germany upon her fleet; five years later she was not spending twice as much as Germany. Again, two years after King Edward came to the throne, German naval expenditure was but just over ten million pounds; a year after his death it was twenty-two million pounds. Now the chief feature of British foreign policy must always be opposition to a growing

or menacing naval power. That, and not the empty talk of 'preserving a balance' upon the Continent, is and must always be the chief pre-occupation of British statesmen when they watch the strength of their rivals.

It will be seen from this lengthy extract how clear Mr. Belloc's exposition of his subject is and how pertinent it is to the present state of affairs in Europe. Briefly, it traces the history of these islands in view of two broad facts—in domestic politics the rise and fall of oligarchical Government, and in foreign politics the changed relations between England and France, her long-time traditional enemy. Throughout his work Mr. Belloc, as is natural, does full justice to the trials and triumphs of the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, whilst, in regard to Ireland, he is careful to recognise its national unity, and careful to point out that only by regarding and treating it as a national unit could or can any solution to the Irish difficulty be found. 'The whole direction of Irish life,' he says, 'political as well as social, is now set toward a material as well as a spiritual advance, and that autonomy, which is the only alternative to subsidy and Imperial legislation (things no commercial oligarchy will grant to a province), is already virtually accomplished.'

In its lucidity and in its fine analysis of political cause and effect this work is a masterpiece.

P. M. MACSWEENEY.

RAMBLES IN CATHOLIC LANDS. By Michael Barrett, O.S.B.
New York: Benziger Brothers.

'TRAVEL, in the younger sort,' says Lord Bacon, 'is a part of education; in the elder, a part of experience.' At school we study books; in travel, places and men. It has been the privilege of the author of *Rambles in Catholic Lands* to be the guest of prelates and abbots of places which he visited, and at which he lingered. He has thus been brought into intimate personal contact with the manners and customs of the people. In his beautiful book he gives us the result of his personal observation and of his varied and interesting experiences of places and men.

The book combines the best features of a guide-book and of a pilgrim's book. It is a chatty, friendly narrative, animated with religious fervour, and manifesting the instinct and perception of an artistic soul. It is a series of enchanting pictures of Catholic villages and towns, monasteries and churches, shrines and sanctuaries, hallowed by sacred tradition and abounding in historical association. These word-paintings are as beautiful and artistic

as the pretty miniature photos with which the book is interleaved throughout. They give us all the local colouring, as well as a mass of historical details. We accompany the author through the Rhine country of prolific vineyards, stately *schloss*, frowning fortresses, and peaceful cloisters. We gaze on the wayside shrines, with their *Pietà*, and statues and quaint prints of saints, so deeply respected and venerated by German Catholics. We ascend the winding paths leading to medieval monasteries, perched on the heights, and reverently admire the familiar Stations of the Cross, with their colossal and coloured figures in relief, that line the roadside. We see groups of men and women 'making the Stations,' and the *hausfrau*, with more or less difficulty, reading the prayers from a well-thumbed prayer-book, whilst the rest devoutly listen. We see the children joyously run up to the priest, with beaming faces and their friendly greeting of *Grüss Gott*, to take his hand in reverent salutation. The elders are not outdone by the children in their respect for their priests, for their greeting, 'Praised be Jesus Christ' is ever on their lips. This is Catholic Germany. It is refreshing, in those days, when we are confronted on all sides with pictures and descriptions of German barbarities, to take up such a book as Father Barrett's and see German Catholics, as they are at home, in their social and religious festivities, in their sincere and simple piety, in their genial and courteous manners, and in their effusive respect for their priests.

The author journeys through Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Switzerland, the Austrian Tyrol, Bohemia, and Northern Italy. He does not follow exactly the lines of the railway, but branches off, on foot or by diligence, into secluded valleys, or ascends snow-capped mountains, and reveals to us monasteries and churches, rich in priceless libraries and works of art, and of great historical importance. Thus we get a true glimpse of the picturesque mountains, lakes, and villages, and become acquainted with places and things of absorbing interest, which the ordinary traveller by train is sure to miss. To one who has the leisure to follow the footsteps of the author, and the soul to linger over the storied past and admire the artistic works of centuries, Father Barrett's book will be a useful and interesting *compagnon de voyage*. To one who wishes to obtain a true picture of the beauties of the Rhineland and of the Austrian Tyrol, and to become familiar with the wealth of art and of history hidden away in the monasteries and churches, *Rambles in Catholic Lands* will be an invaluable help. The author deserves our grateful recognition for having brought those delightful scenes and these artistic and historical places under our notice.

M. R.

LEAVES FROM THREE ANCIENT QURÂNS, POSSIBLY PRE-'OTHMANIC.
 Edited by Rev. Alphonse Mingana, D.D., and Agnes Smith
 Lewis, Litt.D., etc. Cambridge, 1914.

MUHAMMAD never intended, as far as we know, to set all his teaching before the world in a book. His aim was rather to convey to his followers, as occasion arose, the revelation or oracle which was needed for the moment. It was not until after his death that the Suras of the Qurân were collected. The work of collecting was done by Zaid, whom tradition makes secretary of the Prophet. The gathering together of the scattered fragments of Muḥammad's oracles was an arduous task. Many of the fragments had been written on 'date-leaves, bits of parchment, and tablets of white stone.' But most of the Qurân had not been put in writing, and had to be gathered 'from the hearts of men.' When Zaid had brought the oracles into some sort of unity he put his text at the disposal of the Caliph Abu Bekr. It seems, however, that the edition of Zaid was never looked on as really canonical. The enormous number of variants which began to appear in the years that followed the appearance of Zaid's first edition led to the necessity of a second edition. This the Caliph 'Othman saw, and entrusted the task of preparing a canonical Qurân to Zaid and three men of the tribe of Kuraish. To prevent all future disputes, Zaid and his collaborators destroyed all the codices on which their edition was based, except the text which Zaid had written with his own hand for the first edition. This codex was itself soon afterwards destroyed. Thus it came about that the 'Othmanic text was accepted as the canonical, and indeed as the sole existing, text of the Qurân. Textual study of the Qurân was possible, therefore, only within the limits of the 'Othmanic text.

The work before us proves, however, that Zaid's zeal of destruction was not quite successful. Some pre-'Othmanic texts have actually survived, and a few of them are here set out for us in the learned publication of Dr. Agnes Smith Lewis and Dr. Mingana. The MS. containing the fragments is a palimpsest, in which Dr. Smith Lewis succeeded in deciphering some Qurân texts, the peculiarities of which led Dr. Mingana later to see in them remnants of pre-'Othmanic editions. He was able to distinguish three scripts in the fragments, and is of opinion that we have, even in the small fragments now published, conflates of several pre-'Othmanic texts. He is not certain whether any of the fragments, as they stand, were actually written before the time of 'Othman, or whether they are copies of the pre-'Othmanic texts. Of their great age, however, he has no doubt.

The editing of the texts seems to have been done with great

care. The importance of Dr. Mingana's work is obvious. It inaugurates a new period of Qurân criticism. For the theologian it raises interesting questions of parallel possibilities in Biblical text-study. We have, no doubt, the materials supplied by the ancient versions for the critical study of the pre-Masoretic Hebrew text ; but we need, above all, the help of pre-Masoretic Hebrew codices. We should, however, need a great number of fragments, like the Nash Papyrus, to have at our disposal as much of the pre-Masoretic Hebrew text as we have here of the Pre-'Othmanic text of the Qurân.

P. B.

PULPIT THEMES : ADJUMENTA ORATORIS SACRA. Translated by Rev. P. A. Beecher, M.A., D.D., Professor of Sacred Eloquence, Maynooth. Second Edition. Pp. xii. and 583. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

THIS is the second edition of the above work, which we have already reviewed. The brief Preface that the translator uses in introducing the second edition speaks for itself : ' I beg to apologise to the many whose orders for this book have remained so long unfulfilled. The delay has been due neither to the printers nor publishers, but to the unexpectedly rapid sale of the first edition, which, though consisting of more than eleven hundred volumes, was exhausted in six weeks.'

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

- America ; A Catholic Review* (April).
The Ecclesiastical Review (April). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (April). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (April). New York.
The Austral Light (March). Melbourne.
The Ave Maria (March). Notre Dame, Indiana.
The Irish Monthly (April). Dublin : Gill & Son.
The Catholic Bulletin (April). Dublin : Gill & Son.
The Month (April). London : Longmans.
Our Boys (April). Ed. by Christian Brothers, Dublin.
Missionary Record of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate (May). Dublin : Gill & Son.
Life of George Washington. By Very Rev. James O'Boyle, B.A., P.P., V.F. London : Longmans.
Histoire Anecdotique de la Guerre de 1914-1915. Par Franc-Nohain et Paul Delay. (2 vols.) Paris : Lethielleux.
The Personality of Christ. By Dom Vonier, O.S.B. London : Longmans.
Popular Sermons on the Catechism. By Rev. A. H. Bamberg. (Ed. by Rev. H. Thurston, S.J.). London : Washbourne.
The Offices of Vespers and Compline. London : Washbourne.
Australian Catholic Truth Society (Melbourne) : *Blessed Peter Chanel*. A Play for Children. By T. S. Cornish.
Thoughts on the Life and Poems of Francis Thompson. By N. Boylan.
Like Unto a Merchant. By M. A. Gray. New York : Benziger.

GLIMPSES OF GOD'S WAYS AND THOUGHTS¹

BY REV. WILLIAM A. SUTTON, S.J.

WHAT a mass of seeming contradictions God's ways in dealing with men are to our minds! Infinite in love and compassion, stopping at nothing to prove that His delight is to be with them, becoming one of them, undergoing for their sakes everything that any man ever had or would have to endure; giving them His very flesh and blood to be their spiritual nourishment and all-healing medicine; inviting all to come to Him, promising them all that their hearts can desire, fulfilling these promises for all, who come duly, be they who they may; in this life filling them with peace and sober joy in the midst of world-weariness and worries, sorrows and miseries, and imparting to them invincible confidence of arriving at complete union with Him hereafter—the eternal happiness for which all are created, and for which this life is but a probation and preparation throughout, from their first breath to their last conscious sigh.

On the other hand, what a scene of misery, appalling misery, this world presents! A strange mixture certainly, for there is immense good of every kind along with immense evil. 'The web of our life is of a mingled yarn, the good and the ill together.' But at times we get overwhelmed with the consciousness of the world's woes. Everywhere we meet with men, women, children, victims of misery. There is not a town in which there are not great numbers of such. In the slums of great cities like London, Paris, New York, the sights of misery that may

¹ IS. lv. 8, 9.

be met with at all times, are dreadful beyond the power of words to convey. Something like fifty thousand people in London are said to be homeless, no roof to shelter them, winter or summer, and the shelter of multitudes not so utterly destitute makes them little better off.

Famishing, shivering, sick and sore, such is the lot in this world of vast numbers, past, present, and future. This at the best of times, when peace and prosperity bring to the majority so much of the world's good things, that people get 'amusement-mad,' and forget all about God and the great Beyond, eternity, in which we have to exist for weal or woe, compared with which either way all that this life has is of little account except for these eternal issues.

When trying to realise the truth of things, where we are and how we stand, what are the facts of life and their meaning, we must never forget the responsibility of men themselves for the horrors of history, the woes of humanity, the dreadful world-wide war of to-day. What a comment it is on modern civilisation! Men would not, will not accept God's solution of the human problem, the Catholic Church. They wish to solve it for themselves, by their own efforts and inventions, and now we see all their efforts and inventions, all modern civilisation, all their boasted progress, so far as it is part and parcel of their rejecting God and His ways, turned to their mutual destruction. The world's ideal of human happiness, the unbridled love of wealth and pleasure and pre-eminence, is the ultimate cause of this and other appalling calamities. Of course the guilt of responsibility is much more on some than on others. Men being essentially social and interdependent, the less guilty and the innocent get inextricably involved, *quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi*. Kings may call the music; peoples have to pay the piper.

God permits men thus to abuse their liberty as moral agents and to bring on themselves and others these miseries because He can and will overrule all perversity, so that i

will ultimately work for greater good, for His own glory in spite of His enemies, and the good of all that turn to Him, Who alone can make us happy, can give us peace here and hereafter.

Our poor hearts wish that His ways were like ours, that He would show His goodness and love of us by healing our temporal woes. Then we think that we would show our gratitude and be obedient to His laws. God did so deal once with His chosen people. They became an object-lesson of what human nature is, even if all kinds of temporal blessings were to be the immediate reward and earnest for hereafter of serving God. But God warns us, as He warned them, that His ways and thoughts are above human ways and thoughts, as the heavens are above the earth. How the heavens are above the earth we know far better than they did. Science assures us that there are as many glorious suns (each of the so-called fixed stars is one) as there are men now on earth and in all likelihood hundreds of millions more. That would make their number nearer two thousand millions than one thousand millions. Their distance from, or height above, the earth surpasses all that we can conceive or imagine, seeing that light travels some two hundred thousand miles a second, nevertheless, the light from the very distant stars takes thousands of years to come to us, and some years from the very nearest. No wonder, then, God's ways and thoughts are beyond our comprehension.

From the sublime pronouncement of the prophet we get some rude notion of the way God's plan in His creation exceeds all human research, so that nothing remains for us but to believe and trust. This is precisely what God asks of us that we should believe Him and trust Him. We can understand why we should believe, we cannot understand what we believe. But the more we submit our minds and wills to Him, the more we shall be admitted, even in this life, to 'the light of His countenance,' 'for to the thoughtful mind that walks with Him, He half reveals His face.' So shall we experience, to some extent, what

the inspired writer means, when he says, *incerta et occulta sapientiae tuae manifestasti mihi*, 'so shall we be enabled progressively to give God the *rationabile obsequium*, the reasonable service, which He demands.

We can never think too much on the fact that 'we have not here a lasting dwelling-place,' that it is elsewhere and everlastingly that we are made to be happy, that this life is but a preparation and probation, and that consequently nothing is of real importance except for its bearing on eternity.

One of the glimpses that God gives us of His ways and thoughts is that He is constantly outwitting His adversaries. Who would have dreamt that the helpless convict dying a shameful death of torture was God Himself, thus triumphing over all powers of evil? The greatest created intellect, as he is said to be, did not suspect till too late that he was thus being outwitted and conquered. Had he, he 'never would have crucified the Lord of glory.'

Divine Wisdom speaks of Itself as 'playing in the world.'¹ This outwitting of evil, *ars ut artem falleret*, making it subserve God's gracious designs, causing it to bring about good that incomparably surpasses the evil, this characteristic of the divine drama of the universe, the *Divina Commedia*, as Dante calls it, will be, when we come to see the explanation of God's Plan, the crowning and delightful surprise of consummated Revelation. This 'far off, divine event' is the supreme comfort of faith, which makes us certain that in spite of appearances, while we absolutely believe every tittle of revealed truth, nevertheless somehow and finally 'all things will work together for good' in a manner infinitely worthy of Him, Who is 'the Father of Mercies and the God of all comfort.'²

God is constructing an eternal temple for Himself, the stones of which are each an immortal being. Man's probation here is but the shaping of him for his place therein. Each one's place in that eternal pile is determined by his life here. That is the meaning of our mortal life, to settle

¹ Prov. viii. 31.

² 2 Cor. i. 3.

our place in the everlasting Temple, where God's presence manifested according to the position of the conscious materials is the light of glory and happiness, or their opposites, in either case the infinitely just, good, wise, merciful cause of ultimate retribution.

This moral probation is ever at work. How we use our free-will in each issue which presents itself is what is of importance, for such choice is fraught with eternal consequences. This world-wide, never-ending process is very partially intelligible to us. Our comfort under the burthen 'of all this unintelligible world' should be that we are in the hands of God, Who is Goodness itself, Who cannot do the very least unjust or unmerciful thing. He must be all that goodness, wisdom, love, absolute perfection requires. He cannot treat any human being otherwise than such attributes necessitate. He knows all the yearnings of the human heart. He knows all its excuses, its extenuating circumstances, its capacities for weal and woe, not only in His divine nature as its Creator, but for our greatest comfort in His human nature too. Nothing that human nature can endure but He has endured for love of each and all. Therefore, however little we understand how all that we believe works out, our faith makes us absolutely trust Him that He will ultimately combine in one harmonious whole, for the final overthrow of evil, for His own glory and the greatest good of His creation, all that now, while we are on trial, 'shakes our disposition with thoughts beyond the reaches of our soul.'

'The Little Flower' used to say that she hoped as much from God's justice as from His mercy regarding His dealings with His creatures. This wise thought of that most wise child of grace should give us comfort in much of the perplexity which the question of human probation involves, especially regarding those outside the Church whose own grievous fault it is not that they are so.

With regard to the possibility, probability, frequency of acts of contrition and love of God sufficient to put souls right with Him, what St. Thomas teaches about the

remission of original sin among the heathen, may open our eyes and cheer our hearts and widen our hopes on the score of God's 'uncovenanted mercies.'

St. Thomas says¹: 'When the use of reason begins, the thing that then presents itself for consideration is to deliberate about oneself. If the child then puts itself in line with its true end, by grace it will secure the remission of original sin.' Cajetan, the great Dominican commentator on St. Thomas, thus explains this self-adjustment: 'If the child judges that it ought to aim at the higher good, dimly, according to its age, perceived, it has well deliberated about itself, placing its end in true happiness however imperfectly and inchoately.'² To the possible objection, *fides ex auditu*, it may be replied, everywhere there are remnants of God's original revelation, dim notions of Him as Remunerator, which ever present grace can quicken into saving faith.

There is no actual sin without sufficient knowledge of God, for sin is essentially offence of God. Whatever knowledge of God is sufficient for sin must be sufficient for contrition, or for love of Him for His own sake. How many, then, when sorry for their wrongdoing, because contrary to what is right and good and because above all it is so, or when sacrificing themselves in small matters and in great from noble motives, as may and does happen to all kinds of people under certain circumstances, may, helped by grace which is always on the look-out for its opportunity, be really acting thus from love of God, for God is what is right and good, what is man's last, highest end, and true happiness.

¹ *Sum. Theol.*, 1a, 2a, q. 89, a. 6.

² Cf. Gury-Ballerini-Palmieri, *De Sacr. in gen.*, cap. i. where the following note will be found: 'Id ipsum et cum sacramento baptismi contingere potest, ad quod accedere adultus potest per caritatis actum justificationem jam adeptus. Et hunc quidem justificationis modum haud raro contingere in pueris inter infideles rationabiliter teneri potest juxta doctrinam S. Thomae (l.c.): Cum usum rationis (inquit) habere (puer) inceperit . . . primum quod tunc homini cogitandum occurrit, est deliberare de se ipso: et siquidem se ipsum ordinaverit ad debitum finem, per gratiam consequetur remissionem peccati originalis. Quam quidem sui ordinationem in finem sic exhibet Cajetanus (in l.c.): Si sibi appetendum censuerit bonum honestum in confuso, ut aetas illa consuevit, bene deliberavit de se ipso, finem suum in vera beatitudine collocans, quamvis imperfecte et inchoative.'

Some erroneously think that an act of contrition sufficient to get pardon for all grievous sin, implies such sorrow for all sins, venial as well as mortal, and, moreover, that there must be no mixture of motives. This is not the case. Provided the essential motive is there sufficiently, lower motives will not destroy its efficacy, nay, often they are what may be called a necessary help for the great motive to assert itself, however much they may detract from the accidental merit of the act. Nor need one be sorry for all sin, but only for whatever is destructive of God's friendship, which mortal sin alone is. One may still be attached to venial sin and very imperfect yet elicit acts of contrition and of the love of God, efficacious of restoration to the state of grace where necessary, augmentative of it always.

Perfect contrition, perfect love of God, admits of infinite degrees. Perfect means that to which nothing is wanting. When nothing essential is wanting, sufficient perfection is had to secure the essential effect, however much penitents may have to pay here or hereafter for perfect purification, owing to the imperfections of their sufficiently perfect repentance.

We must remember, too, how much goes to constitute grievous sin. Besides sufficient knowledge of God there must be sufficient knowledge of the sinfulness of what is done, and it must be done freely, quite freely. Whatever interferes with this perfect freedom of choice, ignorance, passion, stupor of any kind, lessens the guilt, and may, and often does, effect that there is no sin, where the outer act may be savage or shocking to contemplate.

Sin is not sin because shameful, revolting, abhorrent to civilised notions, etc., but simply and solely because it offends God. This characteristic and sole constituent of sin as such the world cares nothing for. The world regards only what interferes with its own peace, well-being, due order, in other words, crime; and in a less degree whatever runs counter to its standards of conduct, nothing of which necessarily constitutes sin at all, in multitudes of cases quite the contrary. But when grace touches the heart it is the real sinfulness that is deplored. How strangely,

how inscrutably, this is effected no psychological analysis can satisfactorily portray. God alone knows the human heart, God alone is master of all its mysteries. God alone can deal duly with it. Nothing can be more certain than that everyone is justly, long-sufferingly, most mercifully dealt with in the momentous conflict. Over and over again we are assured by the inspired writers that God judges all in equity. Now, equity means much more than strict justice. It means, every consideration being had to circumstances, that men are judged according to what they had, not according to what they had not.

Such reflections suggest how we should all be on the look out to choose rightly, to act unselfishly, to sacrifice ourselves nobly, in little matters mostly, in greater when they occur, to forgive in like manner, to help others according to their claims on us and our means of whatever kind ; for even one such act in seemingly trivial circumstances never fails in being amply rewarded (we are paid off in our own coin sooner or later) and may determine how we will act, when the supreme choice is before us, the final choosing God and His service rather than created things, so grand and liberal is God in remunerating whatever is done for His sake for the right, the true, the good.

Glimpses of God's ways and thoughts help greatly to bear up under the trials of faith, to get comfort out of human woe, for they give solid reasons for being sure that greater good will come out of all, much even now in this present life, overwhelmingly when the final adjustment takes place, God's masterpiece of Wisdom outwitting and overthrowing, once for all, all the machinations of evil.

We are not to think that 'living by faith' need weaken our energies for making the best of everything. Quite the contrary should be the result, for 'we attain to heaven by using this world well, though it is to pass away ; we perfect our nature, not by undoing it, but by adding to it, what is more than nature, and directing it towards aims higher than its own.'¹

WILLIAM A. SUTTON, S.J.

¹ Newman, *Idea of a University*, p. 123.

THE PSYCHOLOGY AND PHYSIOLOGY OF ATTENTION

BY REV. T. E. FLYNN

IN every department of his work the priest encounters the psychological problem of attention. His preaching and catechising depend for their success on his power of arousing and sustaining attention. His theory of prayer, whether vocal or mental, constantly reflects this problem. If he is a teacher, the psychology of attention is the very foundation of his professional equipment. Of course, every priest who sits in the confessional, or alleviates the troubles of his flock, must be a psychologist; but as many a priest practises psychology without reflection, so he constantly applies the laws of attention instinctively and surely, without being aware of it. The rules he has learned in books of Sacred Eloquence, the few short paragraphs in manuals of Moral Theology which treat of prayer, the wealth of teaching in Mystical Theology, are full of practical psychology, and that psychology is the psychology of attention. But *felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*; and not only so, but a scientific knowledge always tends to sureness of touch in practical problems. The doctor has to learn Physiology as well as his *Materia Medica*; the musician studies the science of sound; the law student applies himself to Roman law: though they do not practise the several sciences immediately, they have to acquire them as the foundation of their professional work. It may, then, be interesting to priests to enter upon a brief account of modern work in the physiology and psychology of attention.

Many opposing definitions of attention have been suggested. They fall foul of one another because of differences of view regarding the genesis of attention. Perhaps we shall do best on this occasion to forego the advantage of a hard and fast definition, saying simply that attention means the holding of an object in the full light of consciousness: it is not only seeing, but observing; not only hearing, but comprehending; not only feeling, but being aware of our feeling. It is mainly divided into immediate attention and derived attention. Immediate attention is the attention which is given to some object or topic purely for its own sake, without any impulse from the will. It is inspired by no ulterior motive of fear or reward or politeness or generosity or love. It is independent of any other object for its interest. It is the unreflecting response of the whole being, mind and body too (as we shall presently show), to some stimulus which may be external or internal, sensible or intellectual. It is the spontaneous focussing of the light of consciousness on an object, to the exclusion, more or less complete, of others. I am seated quietly in my room, day-dreaming or reading or writing: I am not deeply absorbed; I hear the clock ticking; I hold out my hand to the fire; I frequently change my position. Suddenly a stone crashes through my window, shattering the glass. In a moment I am on my feet, all my mind is given to the occurrence. The fire might die down or the clock stop, and I should be unaware of it. My mind spontaneously goes out to the one object.

Derived attention, on the other hand, depends upon the association of its object with some other which is interesting in itself. We read in Trevelyan's *Life of Macaulay* of how the preacher, Robert Hall, was found, after the publication of the *Essay on Milton*, lying on the floor deeply engrossed in an Italian grammar and dictionary, trying to learn sufficient Italian to enable him to appreciate the comparison between Milton and Dante. It is hard to imagine the grammar of any language as a study absorbing in itself. The ordinary boy gives

his attention to Euclid for a variety of motives, ranging from a fear of the rod to an ambition to enter some profession, with which the perverse ingenuity of examiners has involved a knowledge of geometry: a Pascal would learn geometry for itself. The lover eagerly scans the ill-written pages from which he hopes to gleam some knowledge of the writer's good estate. An accomplished teacher has a thousand wiles to lure the interest of his pupil to a subject which in itself would evoke no response.

It is of the utmost importance that those who have a lesson to teach, whether it be in the classroom or the pulpit, by the spoken or the written word, should endeavour to elicit immediate attention. But this is the despair of any but the most gifted. We shall in the course of this paper give some account of the laws which must be observed by those who would evoke it. For the moment we will consider one of the chief phases of the derived attention which, in its various degrees, is the second best to which we can attain.

Apperception was a word introduced into pedagogy by Herbart, and as a name it has had a chequered history. It has been used and misused in a variety of senses, so that many now object to it altogether on the score of its vagueness. M. Rœhrich defines it thus: 'It is the state of a man whose attention is awakened by the appearance of an impression, or of a new notion, among the impressions and notions previously stored up in the brain.' It suggests, therefore, the derivation of attention to a subject from its observed relation to something else. In this sense I propose to use the word. It is the fact of this influence on which I would lay stress, without entering into any consideration of the theories of knowledge with which the notion of apperception has been involved. Herbart writes:—

How a bit of bad grammar wounds the ear of the purist! How a false note hurts the musician! or an offence against good manners the man of the world! How rapid is the progress in a science when its first elements have been so well impressed upon us that we reproduce them mentally with perfect distinctness and ease! How slow and uncertain, on the other hand, is our learning of the

principles themselves, when familiarity with the still more elementary precepts connected with the subject has not given us an adequate predisposition ! Apperceptive attention may plainly be observed in very small children when, hearing the speech of their elders, as yet unintelligible to them, they suddenly catch a single word here or there, and repeat it to themselves.¹

Anyone who has travelled in a country with whose language he is but slightly acquainted must have had precisely the same experience. If the language is well known or completely unknown, one can read a book without distraction in a railway carriage in which fellow-travellers are employing it in an animated discussion ; but if one is just learning the language and ‘cannot follow,’ then, if an odd word or phrase which one recognises strikes the ear, one’s mind is irresistibly diverted from the book. The arousing of this apperception is indispensable to the writer of novel or play. Mr. E. F. Benson illustrates this in his *Weaker Vessel* : ‘Do tell me the sort of play that you think succeeds now,’ says the young playwright to the successful actor. ‘The same sort of play that always did succeed,’ is the answer, ‘the play where interesting things happen, and, above all, where interesting things are going to happen. The most effective climax in the world is never so thrilling as that which leads up to it. . . . Things must happen and they must be seen happening.’

Every good teacher takes account of the value of expectancy. He plays upon it and stimulates it. Sound education does not consist in the mere accumulation of facts, but in their organised and enlightened development ; so the conscientious teacher is not satisfied to drop knowledge into the mouths of his pupils, there to take its chance as the mother thrush drops food into the open beaks of her offspring ; but he demands preparation, eagerness, and active reception. The gap in the scheme of knowledge should be seen and felt before it is filled ; the satisfying of one want should always mean the stimulation of another ; things must not only happen, they must always be going

¹ James, *Psychology*, p. 222.

to happen, and they must be seen happening. Facts acquired with an attention such as this will not suffer the fate of the hastily gulped pabulum of the crammer; they will be the foundation of life-knowledge, which, though hidden and overgrown, will still be a support. Whereas, anyone who has had experience of public examinations must know the sensation of the deliberate and joyous forgetting of accumulated knowledge, the eager shedding of facts of history, grammar, chemical tables, in which the happy candidate indulges, once his trial is over, like the insect casting its useless chrysalis now that the glorious springtime has come.

The preacher uses this aid when, at the beginning of his discourse, he shows the connexion of his subject with the general scheme of salvation, when he indicates the problem he will try to solve, or when he insists on the necessity of a meditation of the particular truth he proposes to unfold. The result of this may be an involuntary or a voluntary attention. If it is done well, it may grip the hearers in spite of themselves; otherwise they settle down from a sense of duty to give what attention they may.

I have spoken of 'settling down' to attend. That suggests an important element in the science of attention, the physical side, or the external expression of attention, which accompanies the focussing of the consciousness, and the corresponding material brain processes.

So closely is the psychical state which we call attention wrapt up with the physical phenomena, that some authorities have not hesitated to identify those phenomena with attention: they are attention. M. Ribot, for example, says: 'We consider them less the effects of the psychic state than its necessary conditions, nay, often its constituent elements. . . . If all the physical accompaniments which determine it, which give it a body, are removed, we are left in presence of a pure abstraction, a phantasm.' There is no need to emphasize the connexion of this doctrine with the peripheral theory of emotions so clearly

expounded by the late Professor James ; nor is this the place to criticise that theory. Although we maintain, in opposition to many of the materialist philosophers whom we shall quote, that mental processes are spiritual, yet it is neither novel nor uncatholic to insist on the connexion between soul-processes and bodily states. 'Medieval philosophers,' says Father Maher, 'were just as well aware as our wise men of to-day that age, bodily fatigue, the processes of digestion, disease, stimulants, and the like affect our mental operations.' Usually, at least, conscious spiritual thought proceeds by the aid of material imagination ; and the physical laws which govern the workings of the imagination have an indirect effect on the mental operations. It is this physical side to which we would now direct the reader's attention, while wishing to avoid carefully any suggestion of psycho-physical parallelism, or any other type of Monism, as an explanation of the relation between body and mind.

It is interesting to consider these physiological phenomena in the light of experiment. Duchesne of Boulogne anæsthetised a man, and by electricity caused the contraction of various facial muscles, photographing the subject at several stages of the procedure. He found that often the contraction of a single muscle produced a definite expression of emotion. The contraction of the frontal muscle, for example, resulted in an appearance of attention ; the superior orbicularis in the appearance of reflection ; the pyramidal in that of menace, etc. Now, we observe that in deep attention the forehead is puckered. The frontal muscle, as a matter of fact, has its mobile insertion in the skin of the eyebrow, and its fixed insertion in the posterior part of the skull. When it contracts it raises the eyebrow and wrinkles the forehead. Again, attention is often accompanied by a pouting of the lips : Preyer would attribute this to the primary instincts of the child, whose first attention is given to suckling. Reflection, on the other hand, calls into play the superior orbicularis. This pulls down the eyebrows, causing vertical

ridges, and is accompanied by a tightening of the closed lips. This is the accommodation for difficult vision.

But in complete attention, either external or internal, the effect on the body is more far-reaching still. The body is motionless, the eyes become fixed, the ears are strained, there is a general forward tension in the direction of the object considered; or, if the object is internal, there is felt a pressure on the skull, and a tendency to turn the eyes upwards and inwards. Here, then, we have the root of all gesticulation. The competent actor or orator makes his gesture fit his words (if his gesticulation is artificial at all); it is the modification of his body which would naturally accompany that state of attention which his words signify. Any want of harmony is not only ugly, it is distracting.

But the effect of attention on the body has been studied far more elaborately than this. To give a detailed account of the experiments is beyond the limits of this article, but one should at least summarise the observations, premising that physiological experiments are necessarily worked within very narrow limits owing to the attempt to whittle away all the complexity of concrete life. As in the elementary study of mechanics the student discards elasticity, friction, resistance of air, and the various elements which go together to make a case in real experience, and yet he deals with reality; so we are actually studying the elementary principles of attention, though our subject be only a dog looking at a piece of sugar, or a grown man doing simple addition sums.

It is, then, proved experimentally that attention affects respiration and the circulation of the blood. A dog was trained by M. Nayrac to lie quietly bound on an operating table, and a lump of sugar was held about a foot from his mouth. His whole body at once betrayed the keenest attention. Meanwhile, by means of Marey's cylinder and Chauveau's pneumograph, a record was taken of his respiration. It was found to be very irregular, superficial, and accelerated. The net result of many various experiments

is that intellectual work of short duration accelerates respiration, while long and patient work retards it progressively, and this can end in syncope. Gley, who has done much work on the effect of attention on circulation, enunciates the law that frequency of the pulse is accelerated during the whole period of intellectual work, and that it depends directly upon the intensity of the work. There is a slight, but perceptible, increase in the temperature of the brain, and of the body generally, as a result of intellectual work. Further results are chemical changes and an alteration of the number of blood corpuscles.

That general fatigue is caused by attention would seem to be too well known to demand any systematic investigation. Yet this, too, has been subjected to the test of experiment. A limpness of the fingers is remarked after much brain effort, an impulse to destroy things, as in anger, and a tendency to 'play the fool.' It is the nervous strain demanding an outlet. One has heard of an American doctor, who, after a hard day in a busy practice, finds it necessary to go out motoring in the country for a couple of hours and 'let out his car for all she is worth.' Carteron and Kahn took observations on the professors of the Sorbonne and the Collège de France before and after their lectures. Using Regnier's dynamometer, they discovered distinct fatigue and the loss of muscular power. All this shows the necessity of physical 'fitness' as a condition of good work: *Mens sana in corpore sano*.

The effects of various stimulants have been investigated. With regard to alcohol in particular, it is certain that though there is a brief period of increased power of attention, this is at the expense of undue consumption of energy and is followed by prolonged relaxation. 'The immoderate use of such stimulants,' says M. Nayrac, 'or even their constant use, leads straight to "fatiguability"; and hence they should be used as sparingly as possible.'

Another subject of experimental inquiry has been the number of things to which we can attend at one time. Numbers, letters, words have been instantaneously thrown

on a screen, and after being left there for about a quarter of a second (too short a time to allow of counting), have been instantaneously removed. It is found that four or five objects can grip the attention at once, whether they be simple (figures, letters) or complex (words). With regard to the simultaneous performance of two tasks which are distinct, like reciting one poem and writing another, probably this is only effected by the oscillation of attention from one object to the other, and is not a phenomenon of simultaneity. There is, then, no apparent gain of time over that taken in performing the two operations successively.

If, then, we try to attend to a number of different objects at once the result will be mere distraction : *Pluribus intentus minor est ad singula sensus*. Our senses are in this way a constant channel of distraction. A certain stillness, a repose (which is, however, most probably of the nature of a strong and fatiguing restraint), is ordinarily essential to deep attention.

But it is the evocation of spontaneous attention through the senses which is the chief source of distraction. This is found to be less troublesome when it arises from a continuous or regularly intermittent stimulus than when the interruptions are irregular. We can work quite well with a ticking clock in the room, or in the neighbourhood of a waterfall. One soon gets used to the regular chiming of even loud bells. But the spasmodic noises of a game beneath one's windows, or the irregular peals of thunder in a storm, are always disconcerting. It is an interesting paradox that some people concentrate better in the midst of distraction. The positive effort to counteract the interruption is more than sufficient. One has met a priest who preferred to say his Office in a crowded corridor filled with loudly talking students.

Now, we must look for a moment at one important psychical phenomenon, which has a practical bearing on distraction at prayer. Putting on one side any consideration of distractions wilful *in actu* or *in causa*, we may say that

it is ordinarily impossible and unnatural to keep the mind immovably fixed on God for any length of time. The law of attention is the law of rhythm and change. The essence of 'undistracted' prayer is the constant bringing back of the mind to God. To regard any object with either the eye of the body or the eye of the mind for a long period is only to induce unconsciousness or hypnosis. It is an ascertained fact that the attention can be fixed completely on any single object for no more than thirty seconds at once.

Let the reader place one finger tip on the table, lightly pressing, and concentrate his attention on the sensation. He will not be able to feel the continual pressure for long. What he will observe is a rhythm, an increase and decrease; and he will compare one state with the other. Or let him listen to any continuous sound, the ticking of a watch at night or the noise of a flowing stream, and the experience will be the same.

Much discussion has taken place as to the origin of this phenomenon of 'oscillation.' Some would ascribe it to muscular changes or alteration of the condition of adaptation; and it is known that the ciliary muscles of the eye, for example, contract unsteadily, and there is some ground for supposing that the muscular oscillations are synchronous with the observed oscillations of clear vision. But, on the other hand, we know that the oscillations still take place after paralysis of the muscles of lens and pupil with atropin, or after surgical removal of the lens. Again, the phenomenon has been attributed to orbital fixation. But it is too regular for that; and besides it persists during voluntary movement of the eyes. There is contradictory evidence, too, as to its dependence on the pulse or respiration. There is some positive evidence in favour of its connexion with the rhythmical change of blood pressure exhibited in the Traube-Hering curves; and as these changes are due to rhythmical activity, caused by abnormal excitement, of the vaso-motor centre in the brain, the 'oscillation of attention' may be due to the same cause.

This physiological discussion bears most intimately on

the psychology of attention. What is observed in the jejune experiments of the laboratory must be taken into account in the fuller experience of daily life. Attention, so long as it remains natural, must oscillate. In prayer or study, in preaching or teaching, this must be acknowledged and allowed for. The theme must move. The wise course, the only successful course, is to vary the object continually. In meditation one's mind must be continually moving—a psychological fact for which St. Ignatius, with his customary wisdom, makes allowance in his *Exercises*. The attention is kept within definite limits by the aid of the *compositio loci*, but within those limits the mind travels from one idea to another, considering persons, places, time; exercising the various spiritual 'senses'; asking when? why? where? etc.

As the soul moves through the several 'Mansions' of St. Theresa, the field of consciousness becomes ever more circumscribed and the attention more concentrated. All effort after attention is a progress from a wide field of consciousness, the diffusion of reverie, towards an ever narrower one. It is a constant struggle for monoideism. But when the field is narrowed to a point, when monoideism is attained and retained, we have an abnormal state. To borrow a metaphor from mathematics, attention is the curve indefinitely prolonged in its progress towards unity of idea as its asymptote. Monoideism in prayer means ecstasy—St. Theresa's 6th and 7th Mansions; in a lower order of thought it is *l'idée fixe*. In ecstasy the tautness of the muscles, which we have noticed as characteristic of attention, attains its highest degree. 'The body becomes cold; speech and respiration are suspended, the eyes are closed; the slightest movement would demand supreme effort. The external senses and faculties are at rest. Although ordinarily one does not lose sensation, I have attained to the absolute cessation of it.' Such is St. Theresa's account. In attention men become more or less insensible to acute pain; soldiers in battle are often simply unconscious of the pain of their wounds. Bernadette, in

ecstasy, allowed the taper to burn through her fingers. One has not the slightest intention of naturalising these spiritual phenomena, but they have a natural side ; there is divine interference in their very excess.

Another manifestation of the abnormality of attention is observable in *l'idée fixe*. Here the attention has become morbidly attached to one point of consciousness. It may be arithmomania, in which the mind is everlastingly bent on counting trivial objects like the stones in the street ; or it may be a restless washing of the hands ; or again it may be one of the many forms of scrupulosity.

We have seen that attention cannot be fixed on a single stationary object for more than thirty seconds at a time. Another element to be considered is the time taken to respond to a stimulus, i.e., in technical language the 'reaction-time.' It is supposed that when a stimulus is applied to any organ it is communicated to a centre in the cortex, and that there it acts as the hammer of a gun, liberating the pent-up energy of the cell, which flows out by the efferent nerve. This work of 'exploding' the cell takes time, and it is this time which is measured as reaction-time. What is the mental equivalent of this is not ascertained. It has been measured very carefully, with very interesting results. The reaction-time varies with the individual ; it is shortened by practice, by intensity of the stimulus, by concentration of the attention ; it is lengthened by fatigue.

Professor James considers that the adaptation of the sense organ is one of two complementary forces whose resultant action is necessary for the plenary energy of the brain cell in attention ; and although M'Dougall considers this analysis very inadequate, it is worth consideration. The second of these forces is what James calls the ideational excitement of the brain centre. This is the imagination of an experience before it occurs, called by Lewes the preperception. That there is some effect of the sort, thus 'symbolically' expressed by James, seems obvious from every-day experience, and is demonstrated by exact

experiments on reaction-times. When the object is expected, the reaction-time is shortened. Moreover, the expectancy can actually cause the sensation to appear before the impression is actually made.

When watching for the distant clock to strike our mind is so filled with its image that at every moment we think we hear the longed-for or dreaded sound. So of an awaited footstep. Every stir in the wood is for the hunter his game; for the fugitive his pursuers. Every bonnet in the street is momentarily taken by the lover to enshroud the head of his idol. The image in the mind *is* the attention; and the preperception is half of the perception of the looked-for thing.¹

So it is that men see what they have learned to look for. The ordinary man gazes unmoved on an evening sky which, to the eye of the artist, is full of the most delicate shades of colour. The beauties of a musical composition are lost on the uneducated ear. Reading and writing react on each other precisely for this reason: one learns to appreciate beauty of style only after the travail of self-expression; and one cannot learn to write except in the measure in which one has learned to read.

It is interesting to consider the dynamic side. One may perhaps describe it roughly as follows. The brain must be considered as a field of energy, containing many centres in communication with each other telegraphically. There is correspondence between purely mental thought and these physiological centres. Any ideation is accompanied by the awakening of activity in a centre. The association of ideas is reflected in the sympathetic awakening of other cells; a habit of thought in a 'brain-track.' When we are engaged in deep attention there is a constant flow of energy in the track between the centres concerned. Any distraction is represented by a disturbing current. If in spite of distraction the attention is maintained, it is because this second stream is diverted into some accustomed course and flows away harmlessly and unheeded. The old story of Sir Walter Scott's schooldays illustrates this.

¹ James, *Psychology*, p. 235.

Scott was constantly beaten in his class work by a school-fellow who had a nervous trick of fingering a certain button on his coat while he was successfully answering the master's question. Scott conceived the brilliant idea of cutting off that button, with the result that the nervous pupil was discomfited and Scott passed above him. The constant disturbing inflow of energy had been unconsciously shunted off through the button; when its customary outlet was closed, it interfered with the steady flow between the brain centres in use.

The same theory does something to explain the effect of leaving the mind fallow when we have unsuccessfully attempted to solve some problem or to remember a name which is 'on the tip of the tongue.' Our efforts have set the stream going; to proceed further will only result in making it turbid. Dismiss the problem from the mind, turn to an entirely different subject, and the nervous connexions will be established automatically, and one's mind will be suddenly illuminated with the sought-for idea or word. All this is merest suggestion; but the result is a matter of common experience, whatever be the explanation.

Finally, this theory is illustrated in the physical effort we make at the arousing of attention, the stretching of arms, the ruffling of hair, etc. It is the bodily accompaniment of the dynamic processes in the brain, by which we try to rouse the centres to a greater pitch of energy.

M. Rœhrich, whose work on attention was awarded a prize by the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, concludes the several parts of his treatise with practical rules for the guidance of those whose business it is to evoke attention. His laws are based on physiological experiment of the type illustrated above.

The first law of 'primitive' attention, i.e., the attention we have called 'immediate,' is that the degree of attention evoked depends, not upon the intensity of the objective stimulus, but upon its degree of vivacity. Hence we have the rule that to keep the attention at stretch successive impressions should constantly progress in intensity

and in vivacity. The progress in intensity has limits which are soon approached, but which must never be passed. The speaker whose only notion of securing attention is to raise progressively the pitch of his voice, is a mere ranter; nothing is so fatiguing as a shouted discourse. But a lively stimulus is necessary. The voice should always be clear and cutting. As great vivacity is attained by subsiding into a low tone after an outburst, as can be attained by the opposite procedure.

The teacher who instructs or scolds his pupils in uniformly resounding tones will not be heard; but if he can pass in shades from an energetic tone to one more grave and gentle, he will be sure of eliciting a sustained attention. These changes must not be too sudden or too rapid, else they run the risk of causing distraction and fatigue.

Secondly, it is necessary that the adaptation of the sensorial organ to the stimulus should lead to some sort of judgment. To elicit and sustain attention, it is of importance that each impression should be distinct, that it should form a whole, and that the hearers should be able to assimilate it. J. J. Rousseau insists on the necessity of a very clear pronunciation in the teacher, which guarantees to each word its appropriate value and which keeps awake the interest of the pupil. But monotony must be avoided. Distinctness is necessary only for those things which must make an impression. 'People who "talk like a book" are rightly considered very wearisome.'

Again the reaction-time, the time allowed for an impression to sink in and produce its effect, must be greater when the impression is a surprise than when it is expected. The interval between two impressions should not be too long, for fear of distraction, nor too short, lest these impressions be blurred.

Several impressions, which all tend in the same direction, will support one another; but if there is opposition between them, they will neutralise one another. Speech and gesticulation, music and pictures, may be used together effectively; but any jarring between them results in distraction.

Again, after treating of apperception, M. Rœhrich discusses at some length the rules of its employment.

The first of these rules is of interest to the preacher whose business it is to deal with time-worn themes, who has to be a scribe drawing from his treasure things old and new. For an apperception it is not enough that the notion presented should be new, it must appear new. And the author goes on to say that, on the other hand, the new notion need not correspond to any extraordinary or unheard-of fact. Apperception is best exercised on notions which are familiar, provided that they either contain an element of novelty or are treated in a novel manner. But no matter how new a notion may be it will be ineffective unless its novelty stands out in its relation to other notions already acquired, unless, in fact, it finds its place and is felt to fill the place. The layman who visits the scientific laboratory is surrounded by novelties, but he gives them scant attention, because they are too completely novel to fit into his stock of ideas ; there is no support thereto which they can cling, nor anything which affords a standard of comparison. The new notion should be similar to, but not identical with, acquired notions. The realism which is now the vogue in literature and art does not mean the absolute representation of every-day life. That would be realism, but it would not be art, for which there must be at least selection and rejection of details. There is no art in photography, if it is the photography of the beginner whose one idea is to expose a plate and press a bulb, thus taking a picture of whatever happens to be in the field. But photography may be an art, and nowadays is, when it chooses effects and conquers difficulties of elimination ; when, in short, it does not merely reproduce. Pleasure is felt when we recognise the elements of experience selected, rearranged, and adapted.

This linking of the new with the old should be effected by gradual transitions, each of which adds an element of enlightenment. Rousseau writes : ‘ It is never constraint, but always pleasure or desire, which must produce this

attention. If [the pupil] put a question, answer just so far as is necessary to nourish curiosity, not to satiate it.' This is *l'art de perdre du temps*.

Finally, there is the law of repose, which is applicable to attention as to every other phase of activity. Between any two claims to attention there must be an interval of rest sufficient to allow of the mind's taking in and reacting upon the one claim before the next is preferred. The neglect of this law results in mere chaos, bewildering and stupefying. This is part of the sin of 'cram'; it is the cause of the futility of perorations where good resolutions are proposed one on top of another, breathlessly, unemotionally, and fruitlessly.

The new psychology, then, insists on the intimate connexion between mind and body. If its most illustrious exponents are in error as to the nature of this connexion, that is no reason why we should fail to study their experimental work. That work, in the matter of attention, emphasizes the dependence of the mind on the body. Although the mind's workings are spiritual activities, they are conditioned by a material body, which is limited in its powers and easily fatigued. If we would awaken instinct or develop the mind, we must take thought for its handmaid: the body's moods must be studied, its assistance wooed, its limitations considered; and here the results of laboratory work provide a guidance which we should use to the full.

T. E. FLYNN.

MONSIEUR AMONG THE MUSHROOMS

A 'MODERN' PHILOSOPHER AT LARGE

By A. NEWMAN

I

MONSIEUR was an extremely active little man, whose activity appeared to be of no value whatever. His nose, which was his most striking feature, seemed by its shape to suggest that it desired to escape from his face. His ears were so peculiarly small that one could scarcely have been excused for exhibiting surprise had they suddenly disappeared inwards. His eyes were wide and full of astonishment, as though for him this world provided an endless panorama of surprises.

He was a small man, round and swollen, so round, indeed, as to prevent taller people from bestowing that superior patronage upon him which causes such pleasurable sensations in the bestower. As to dress, he possessed ideas of his own.

'We should reflect, and never obtrude,'¹ he said not infrequently. 'And if we are to find anything we must begin by losing ourselves.'²

He had perfected, after considerable expense, a somewhat elaborate sartorial colour scheme. And his clothes, even to his socks, were capable of presenting, on being turned inside-out, a second shade. In this matter he was scrupulously consistent; for after tramping along a dusty road in raiment entirely adapted to the colour of the dust, so that he appeared merely as a rather solid cloud, he would effect the turning inside-out of his garments on

¹ Diogenes Laertius, vii. § 116.

² Rickaby's comment on Descartes (*First Principles*, p. 113.)

some suitable spot, between the macadam and the grass, and finally enter the domain of green as verdant as the freshest blade beneath his feet.

And how perfect a philosophy was his ! with harmony as its object and the natural world as its analogy.¹ Why, even in the artificial there was the expression of his theory : the very dust of the road was absorbed by its surroundings, so that none should say where the track began and where it ended. Did not the sea reflect the sky, and the grass the grasshopper ? Had not the flowers taken their colours from the rainbow when their eyes were damp with gratitude for rain ? And surely their backs had become green by gazing at the grass ? Did not the snowdrop take its purity from the snow ? and the sweep his blackness from the soot ? But it were unwise to delay the dreadful truth. The analogy of the pantry² was destined to be smashed in the scullery.³

And who shall smile as he contemplates the dismay with which Monsieur discovered his *cul-de-sac* ? There it lay at his feet, a displeasing and unashamed destroyer of theories. There, with its corpse-like head and hideously human pinkness beneath ; the growth of an hour that would spurn the centuries ; a puff-ball paradox ; the flower that blooms in darkness, and turns the pallor of death to the daylight, and the pink of health to the verdure through which it obtrudes itself !

And as, for Monsieur, all things in nature,⁴ with one exception, obeyed the laws of harmony and reflection,⁵ that one exception must be more powerful than all nature.⁶

¹ Stobæus, Ecl. ii. 132, τὸ ὁμολογουμένως ᾄδν.

² *The Analogy of Religion*, Joseph Butler.

³ Through the culinary preparation of *Agaricus* (*Psalliota*) *campestris*.

⁴ *The Philosophy of Sleep*, Robert Macnish, LL.D., p. 59. Dr. Macnish proves that even in dreams there is a rigid law of harmony and association, but in an exaggerated form. Smoke in the sleeper's chamber may cause him to dream of Nero's destruction of Rome, etc.

'Some truths are so near and obvious that a man need only open his eyes to see them,' etc.—Berkeley's *Principles of Human Knowledge*.

⁵ *Leviathan*, c. xiv., Hobbes.

⁶ 'Our belief in the necessity and universality of causation is the belief that every manifestation of force must be preceded and succeeded by some equivalent manifestation.'—Spencer, *First Principles*.

So it was that among the mushrooms Monsieur believed he might find that for which as a philosopher he sought. Yet, how should so diverse a congregation be gathered together, save by the pursuit of spores, small and great, yellowish-brown¹ or purplish-black,² into the very stomach of the earth.³ And in such a pursuit how many would be the chances of self-enrichment for evilly-disposed persons, whose lives were spent in tending that which Monsieur so much desired.

Monsieur, in his eagerness to select and acquire, dived into the earth, and toiled through tunnels which had once enclosed fiery and roaring monsters of iron, but which were now silent mortuaries of the mushroom. Indeed, that in itself was another proof of the truth upon which our philosopher had stumbled: for did not the silence of these underground chambers testify to the displacement of noise and steam-begotten force by that which in nature was proved all-powerful by its isolation?

Here it was that Monsieur learned how the mushroom might be persuaded to grow; and here it was that for many days he toiled unobserved, appropriately attired in black, with a light heart and a somewhat lightened purse. And in those first, fresh, active days he found time even to press his theory upon others, as a physic to be received in small measures, while the giver retains something, if it even be the bottle.⁴ And so it came that, in a little while, there arose a respectful company of believers.⁵

'How great, indeed,' Monsieur would exclaim, 'is the mushroom! It has claimed the round world for its habitation; and when man rears his cities of stone⁶ it demands

¹ *Agaricus squarrosus*.

² *Agaricus campestris*.

³ Underground chambers and tunnels are frequently occupied by mushroom farmers, as the mushroom grows best in complete darkness.

⁴ Ref. to Manichæans, *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, p. 345; 'economy' practised by them.

⁵ Diels, H., *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Band I. (1906); Benn, A. W., *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 59.

⁶ 'Sometimes the mushroom grows to an enormous size, and three large specimens are stated to have lifted a flagstone, weighing eighty pounds, in the city of Worcester.'—*Toadstools*, Somerville Hastings, F.R.C.S.; Gowans and Gray (1907).

of him that even in the heart of cities it shall be given space to express itself in silence.'

There was the world itself to be considered. For presently it put its claw into its own stomach, where Monsieur and his disciples were digesting wisdom, and demanded to know the reason for an æsthetic appreciation of a commodity interesting only for its commercial value. And Monsieur, dragged into daylight, expostulating vigorously, and infuriated at the incongruity of his attire, the reverse side of which was shaded in harmony with the London atmosphere at that particular season, could hardly be considered a happy exponent of the transcendental.¹ How indeed should ravings and grumblings and half-expressed anathemas, strung as beads upon a thread of truth, which was to lead men safely from their present intellectual labyrinth, seem in any sort different from the wisdom of those whom the world had, *ex abundanti cautela*, set aside in strong houses?

Here, indeed, were the materials for a most undignified martyrdom²; and with disciples enough to encourage the soul in distress, yet unwilling to interfere in the business of the executioner or to occupy the centre of the stage. Learned and serious ones of the world were assembled quickly, and Monsieur arraigned as an *émigré*, who had proved traitor to the 'universal consciousness'³ by setting up a standard of intelligence which depended for its rectitude merely upon the vigour of his expostulation.

¹ Monsieur, acting upon Bacon's advice, was no friend of *a priori* methods. And yet the exponent of the 'transcendental unity of apperception' had a respect for objective reality and may be said to provide a possible intellectual ancestor for Monsieur. See Mahaffy's brusque reply to Trendelenburg that 'Kant never denied their objectivity unless in an *absurd* sense' (*Critical Philosophy*, p. 68).

² A philosopher's martyrdom is not an original idea. In 432 B.C. Anaxagoras was accused of teachings which disagreed with popular opinions. He taught that the sun was a red-hot mass of stone, and that the moon was an earthy body, shining by reflected light, with an irregular surface, and partially built over (*Early Greek Philosophy*, Benn, 1908). According to some of our authorities, Anaxagoras was tried for blasphemy and condemned.

³ *Manual of Psychology*, Stout. Like a good modern, Stout refuses to be dogmatic upon the question of consciousness; but he recommends as a working theory that there is a 'universal consciousness' floating about which may take the place, if we like, of the cruder theory of individuality.

And who can forget the genial and superior smile which rested upon the faces of his judges? The mushroom was the all-powerful exception! Just so. Who could doubt it? But for such as believed in it there had been made complete provision. The exception might be right; but they preferred the universal law of harmony to remain unbroken. Prove his exception, and law itself should cease. How, then, could Monsieur object to illustrate that law by joining those who differed from the world on some small matters?

‘But how,’ exclaimed Monsieur, ‘shall I make progress in my investigation?’

He was assured with gentleness that, even though placed *extra muros*, he should have ‘every facility,’ ‘ample scope,’ and that, above all, he might hope to be well again.

‘But to what end?’ he interrupted.

‘In order,’ it was explained to him, ‘that you may be in harmony with the majority.’¹

‘Why, then,’ he demanded, ‘shall we not drown ourselves, and be in harmony with the unnumbered things of the sea?’ And afterwards, with dignity, as one expounding the unspeakable: ‘But the majority³ here are mushrooms! Man, their toy, is nowhere. It is he who is *extra muros*!’

So that being said, the company of learned and serious ones was scattered, and Monsieur introduced to a state of life with which he was unfamiliar.

¹ ‘But I, O Athenians, in this perhaps *differ from most men*; and if I should say that I am in anything wiser than another, it would be in this, that not having a competent knowledge of the things in Hades, I also think that I have not such knowledge.’—Plato, *Apology of Socrates*, p. 16.

² Probably Monsieur had in his mind some grotesque application of Schopenhauer’s *Metaphysics of the Will*, when he explains that there is not a greater portion of Will as thing-in-itself in a man than in a stone, i.e., a pebble on the beach. *Essay On the Will in Nature*, Bohn’s Philosophical Library (1889).

³ ‘They (mushrooms) are members of the class Fungi, a family which also includes such various forms as the vinegar plant, moulds, yeasts, and *bacteria*!’—*Toadstools*, Somerville Hastings, (1907)

II

Here, indeed, was a Daniel dragged to Bedlam; and Bedlam itself a hive of masonry, ringed by a huge wall. Within were the courts of princes and all the kings of the earth, aliened for a time, but surely to come again into their kingdoms. Here were sages and dreamers, poets and those who saw visions; some who possessed the gold of the Indies, yet strutted in rags because the rulers of the house denied them liberty. Holders of secrets there were who whispered in corners that which could shake a throne. Wise men, too, who knew all things; and when a revelation was almost uttered, realised on a sudden that none could be worthy of it, and feigned to forget. Here were energy beyond belief, activity, serious purposes.

And into the midst of these wonders Monsieur was projected, his brain bowed beneath a weight of budding theories. So active was he in sorting and labelling his mental treasures that for the first days of his captivity he accepted the mechanical attentions of his keepers, and said nothing of the procession of wonders that passed down the highway of his soul.

Vainly had those who believed in him exerted their whispering powers at a hundred age-holes in the walls, and in vain had one of them torn a garment of green in the embraces of a similarly tinted tree.¹ Most surely the prophet slumbered while the sons of the prophet strove to release him from his prison.

But how rich were these days for Monsieur. No longer in contact with the material mushroom, he was able to contemplate it dispassionately and to realise at a distance its magnitude. But what need was there that he should struggle to escape? Better remain at rest, and leave the

¹ This goes to convince us that the disciples of Monsieur had quite completely assimilated his philosophic teaching; for the green cloth worn in the vicinity of trees indicates an almost slavish subjection to the laws of harmony and reflection. We are prepared, however, by this fact, for a more practical application of the theory of harmonious colour, which occurs from time to time as the history proceeds, as when observations are made from behind a sheet of cardboard painted to resemble a stone wall, and also in the means of communication which were presently set up.

place when it pleased him. For with his knowledge of the mushroom he was all-powerful. Behind the material which witnessed to a supremely strong exception, there was the energy of mind that drove and guided, swept aside and conquered. And in the mushroom itself there was unity without contact.¹ The mushroom was, indeed, a giant body torn and strewn over the earth. There was the fungus of the hair.² There was that which, by its shape, clearly proved the existence of brain.³ There was a form which made certain that the egg was the origin of that which it contained.⁴ There was the manifestation of that which generates.⁵ And there was a growth which appertained to the lower animals.⁶ There were many things besides: the star-like eyes,⁷ from which the sun and moon derived their radiance; the great masses of body and limb⁸; the fingers⁹ and the features¹⁰; the mouth that devoured.¹¹ There was the warrior¹² from whose wounds blood could flow. There was that which indicated the cellular structure of the human body, and indeed of all living things.¹³ And yet all this was incalculably strong, and all this was inexplicably united.

There was more than human power; for was not there material dust¹⁴ that might blind a pursuer?

¹ That is, in Monsieur's opinion, the mushroom family had the same protoplasm everywhere.

² The common mould or fur-like growth found on damp walls or on jam and other food stuffs.

³ *Coryne sarcoides*, which exactly resembles the human brain.

⁴ *Scleroderma vulgare*, or common earth-ball.

⁵ *Phallus impudicus*. It would be interesting to discover how much Phallic worship owes to this form of the mushroom.

⁶ *Mutinus Caninus*.

⁷ *Geaster sericeus*, the earth-star.

⁸ *Polyporus giganteus*, the giant-tuft, and *Polyporus Squamosus*.

⁹ *Clavaria rugosa*.

¹⁰ *Daldinia concentrica*.

¹¹ *Agaricus (Pleurotus) ostreatus*, the Oyster of the Woods.

¹² *Lactarius rufus*, the Slayer.

¹³ *Tubina cylindrica*. 'This curious group of organisms occupies the border land between the vegetable and animal kingdoms. It creeps over the surface of rotten wood in search of food, and consists of a jelly-like mass of protoplasm. When the fruiting period arrives the protoplasm becomes condensed into small cylindrical masses of pink colour, which in a few hours become transformed into reddish brown capsules of minute spores.'—*Toadstools*, Somerville Hastings, p. 75.

¹⁴ *Lycoperdon perlatum*, or Puff-ball.

How poor a thing man appeared, after all, compared with the mushroom that could set its seal upon man's food, and say: 'That is mine!'—grasp a tree in its embrace,¹ make the forest its own,² lay its fingers on the fields; encompass eternity indeed, and set bounds upon the dances of the dead.³

How could Monsieur fear with so great a power to befriend him? He was in peace, and should he not continue in peace as long as it pleased him?

But there were some who thought differently. To the world of those skilled in potions and cures, Monsieur was in no wise to be left alone. He, being a novelty, must be acquired; books must be born of him; reputations raised, or at least sustained; and to that end it became necessary that he should reveal all that was in his heart. Monsieur had certainly spoken before the learned and serious ones who had sat in judgment upon him; therefore he would talk to those who should come to grow wiser by watching him.

But Monsieur was silent, and smiled upon any who questioned him. Once, indeed, he said:

'Unless I am left alone, I shall leave you. It is now my pleasure to remain. It may, however, please me to depart!'

Subtle ones there were, who professed to understand;

¹ *Fistulina hepatica*, the Oak-tongue; *Bulgaria inquinans*, and *Tubulina cylindrica*, which has already been described.

² *Phallus impudicus*, or 'the Stinkhorn, and well it deserves its name, for its smell is detestable . . . the odour is so distinctive that a specimen can be detected by it many yards off. . . . Something like heroism was required to secure the photographs shown . . . begins to exhale a most fetid and disgusting odour, more like rotting cheese than anything else, but much too horrible to describe.'—*Toadstools*, Somerville Hastings, F.R.C.S.; London: Gowans and Gray, 1907, p. 73.

³ *Marasmius oreades*, or Fairy-ring toadstool. 'Who has not seen on our pastures and downs circles of grass of a deep green shade? They are popularly believed to be caused by the midnight dances of elves and fairies, and are known as fairy rings. Early in Autumn these rings are covered with the Fairy-ring toadstool.'—*Toadstools*, Somerville Hastings, p. 70. These rings are perfectly covered with toadstools, and only a photograph or a sight of the real growth could convince one of the perfection of the form. A circle has always been the symbol for eternity. Elves and fairies are understood to be the souls of dead pagans.

and such came to him secretly, pretending that they believed in him; and of these he would inquire:

‘What is the noblest thing?’

‘The mushroom,’ they would answer.

‘Then become a mushroom if you would learn nobility.’¹

Still wiser ones there were who lowered speaking-pipes into his chamber, in the hope that he might converse with himself. But into their pipes he would pour suitable oaths, and afterwards close them with corks of fungus.

Others, professing greater subtlety, served mushrooms with his meals, in the hope that they might induce him to speak; but he would set the repast aside, and demand of those who waited upon him:

‘Wherefore do you set your superiors before me?’²

It came about, therefore, that his keepers were instructed to use what brains they possessed, and to remember as well as they could any chance words he might have to say. They must on no account permit him to observe them in the act of taking notes, and must interpose some convenient barrier between Monsieur and any literary operation which they might think fit to perform. They must neither exhibit interest in his conversation nor express surprise should he proceed to expound some astonishing or enlightening truth.

The mushroom-growing properties of the asylum plantation and the actual resources of the estate were carefully ascertained; and until the mushroom had been cultivated by artificial means, Monsieur was, at stated

¹ This sentence may be more easily understood when Monsieur’s respect for Demosthenes is taken into account. He probably had in his mind the manner in which that orator pointed a moral by comparing Philip’s activity and consequent success with the merely theoretical activity of the people of Athens. οὐ δὲ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν εἰ στρατευόμενος καὶ πονῶν ἐκείνος αὐτὸς καὶ παρὼν ἐφ’ ἅπασιν καὶ μηδένα καιρὸν μηδ’ ὥραν παραλείπων ἡμῶν μελλόντων καὶ ψηφιζομένων καὶ πυνθανομένων περιγίγνεται.—*Olynthiacs*, ii. 23. And, of course, Demosthenes’ point is that Philip was successful because he took the field and laboured in person, instead of staying at home and passing ever so many excellent resolutions in committee.

² This seems to be a gentle hint that those who troubled Monsieur were of the company of those who exalt their food to the height of being the one thing which matters.

hours of the day, led to those spots where it flourished unaided by man.

To the satisfaction of the Governor a vigorous growth of fine puff-balls was discovered by chance in a thickly timbered portion of the estate; and thither Monsieur was at once conducted. Here, indeed, was a sight which filled him with enthusiasm. How certain an evidence of force beyond man's understanding. The artillery of the all-powerful; an arsenal packed to the roof with powder. That was something upon which to feast the eyes. At the sight of it, indeed, Monsieur's eyes were seen to fill with tears; and when he had regained control of himself, he reverently plucked one of the precious globes and, walking to the boundary wall, flung it into the outer world. Afterwards, upon his knees, he contemplated that which he realised was to deliver him from bondage.¹ But the time was not yet, and he must learn patience.²

For a while he held converse with his beloved puff-balls; but a sudden rising to his feet revealed to him the absence of his keepers. There was a crackling of paper; and they emerged from behind trees.³ Then it was that he desired to see the Governor of the Asylum. Monsieur's wish should be granted as soon as the Governor had prepared himself for the interview. Much, indeed, had to be done. A writer of shorthand must be hidden behind

¹ 'There was more than human power; for was not there material dust that might blind a pursuer' (ibid.). The word 'blind' is in this case used unquestionably in the sense intended when one says 'love is blind.' And this feeling on Monsieur's part that the puff-ball would deliver him from bondage is clearly the second stage reached in his mental process, partly intuitive, by which he became quite certain that there was a stupefying effect from the application of puff-ball powder. How far Monsieur was correct will be discovered later when the Members of Committee feel drawn towards him and are strangely 'sympathetic' and when his keepers are overcome by a 'stupor of sympathy.'

² This has no reference to a popular game.

³ This is positive proof that they had been taking notes; but so far it has been impossible to trace any resemblance between the two accounts presented, as the result of this note-taking, to the Governor. I am inclined to believe that one of these men has merely invented his supposed report, probably because he was out of earshot. But as it is impossible to say which of the keepers heard Monsieur's words, and which did not, I think it wiser not to reproduce either of the accounts.

some screen. The Governor was smarting under instructions from the compounders of potions and cures. He had been told to 'take every precaution,' to 'let nothing slip,' because the case of Monsieur was 'quite unique,' capable of yielding 'much valuable data'; and, of course, it was of the 'utmost importance' to 'maintain the traditions' of the institution which, as one of the compounders said, 'occupied an undisputed place in the forefront of mental research'; and the fact of the Governor having taken trouble would 'redound to his credit.' The Governor, therefore, played his part like a man. Long-stalked toadstools replaced the flowers in his vases. The literature of mushrooms was strewn over his table. Pictures of mushrooms had been framed, and were even now taking the place of the more homely engravings on his walls. Nothing was left undone, because the Governor had been advised to 'spare no expense.' Most of the parlour chairs were removed in order that Monsieur might have space to examine the wonders which had been prepared for his admiration. An ancient piano-stool, with one leg, had been covered with white holland cloth, drawn hastily together with threads below the seat; in fact all had been done that imagination could suggest to persuade Monsieur to exhibit the peculiar symptoms of madness which made his case so attractive. When all was ready, and Monsieur was permitted to enter, he surveyed the room, with a smile. Here, at least, he was at home! The Governor was the only human being visible; and Monsieur made haste to address him.

'Have they also assured you that you may hope to be well again?'

The Governor had not expected so complete an appreciation of his efforts.

'I have,' he said, 'received no assurance of hope.'

'Do you, then, worship the mushroom?'

He had learned from Monsieur to admire it.

At that Monsieur, as was most natural, showed much satisfaction; and with a sweep of the arm, which was to

indicate the unity of the apartment and its occupants, he possessed himself of the Governor's hand. For Monsieur was too good a philosopher to forget that man, as well as being himself, is that which surrounds him also.¹

'I place my thoughts before you,' he exclaimed. 'Do we know all things?'

'I hope not,' said the Governor.

'It is possible, then, that we may know more! Who is there to deny² that what I have found may not be the true exception which proves the ruler?'

'I cannot follow you.'

'That being so, remain at rest in your place, and, observe this,' tearing a toadstool from a vase. 'Here is that which denies the laws of harmony and reflection. Here is that which rears a death-head to the heavens, and shows pinkness to the soil³; which resembles nothing in nature but that which is decaying. This thing, I declare to you, is stronger than that which obeys, and therefore it is the master.'

This expression of the unspeakable was terminated by an explosion. A sneeze from the writer of shorthand found Monsieur, with the energy of an avalanche, precipitated against a screen, and afterwards rebounding with righteous fury upon the Governor.

'Hirer of spies! Betrayer!' poured from Monsieur's mouth. And after that, still spluttering with disgust, he was led gently away.

¹ This must in no way be confused with the so-called 'law of indissoluble association,' more or less the doctrine of Hartley and Hume, and re-expounded by James Mill in his *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind* (1829).

² This indicates Monsieur's intellectual power; and it is hardly surprising that he 'floored' the Governor, simply because the latter had a scientific mind. For in his opening address to the British Association in Birmingham, Sir Oliver Lodge says: 'Science has no authority in denials. To deny effectively needs much more comprehensive knowledge than to assert. And abstraction is essentially not comprehensive: one cannot have it both ways. Science employs the methods of abstraction and thereby makes its discoveries.'—*British Association Report*, 1913.

³ Monsieur must have had in his mind *Agaricus Campestris*, and merely chose a convenient toadstool as typical of the species.

III

It was upon the day following his visit to the Governor that Monsieur saw one of those who believed in him. He was upon his daily pilgrimage to the plantation of puff-balls, when he stumbled upon a single mushroom of great size, below the boundary-wall. Here was another deliverer! What should Monsieur do but crouch upon the soil beside it? This was a strange mushroom, for upon its death-head was inscribed a message:

‘We shall wait for you night and day. Having found this, pluck it up and cast it over the wall where your believers await you.’

Monsieur, with reverence and care, examined this mushroom in masquerade. It was indeed a gauntlet flung up to nature! And where the root should have been there was a weighted spike; so that if this cunningly-devised engine were cast aloft it would descend and remain planted in the earth!

How much reason for joy! Here was evidence of strength, of conviction and energy. They whom he had instructed might yet lead him. For the present, at least, they should know that he still lived and loved them. So he concealed the cunningness of the mushroom, and at a convenient moment, flung it into the outer world. While the messenger was yet in the air a strange presence, clothed in cardboard stones, and crowned with broken glass, rose above the wall, grinned upon Monsieur for a moment, and was gone.¹

‘The season of my departure shall be near; and my time of detention must be persuaded to shorten itself,’ Monsieur muttered. And aloud: ‘I desire a bag in which to store those puff-balls that have reached maturity.’

A bag was brought to him. It remained to be seen if there was sufficient of that which was to deliver him.

¹ This will be explained by a previous footnote (p. 591). The apparition was, of course, merely one of Monsieur’s disciples doing what he could to obey the laws of harmony and reflection, and at the same time preventing Monsieur’s keepers from observing him.

It was unfortunate that the silk hat of a Chairman of Committee should have been penetrated by the spike of a mushroom in masquerade. The accident could only be accounted for by the fact that he was directly beneath the messenger when it fell; but that discovery did not console him for a scarred scalp and an enforced attendance upon the purveyor of hats.

Monsieur and his mushrooms were the subject of a tropical debate in Committee; and finally Monsieur was dragged, perspiring, from his puff-ball plantation, bearing a bag of mature powder in his arms.

The Chairman displayed his damages—the hat, and that which had penetrated it; and for Monsieur's comfort he lowered his head to expose the extent of the contusion wrought by the spike.

Monsieur was then requested to say whether he had thrown the masquerader. He had not; being engaged upon matters of great importance in the plantation of puff-balls.

Could he, then, explain why such inscribed missiles should descend upon the innocent.

After consideration, Monsieur declared that, speaking as a Determinist,¹ it seemed clear to him that the spike and the skull were made to meet each other: the one being made and the other meat; because law in the material predicated law in the spiritual.

Could Monsieur, then, explain the inscription.

After consideration, Monsieur declared that, speaking as an Idealist, he could not trust himself to promise that

¹ It will be enough for the reader who has neither the time nor the inclination to read James or Sidgwick, in order to understand what moderns mean by the word, to consider that Determinism means Fatalism. That meaning will serve to make the sentence intelligible. But, naturally, I will not enforce the word Fatalism as more than a rough translation; for we have Mill explaining the distinction when he says that Fatalism means a belief that all our acts are determined by *fate* or external circumstances, independently of our feelings and volitions. Determinism, on the contrary, maintains that action is determined by feelings (*Logic*, bk. vi. c. ii. § 2, n. 3). '*In practice*,' as Maher has it (*Psychology*, p. 398), 'they will certainly differ. The *determinist* may seek to arouse good desires in himself or others; the *fatalist* will abandon the attempt as useless. But *logically* fatalism flows from determinism.' The use of the word goes to prove the soundness of Monsieur's mind.

the meaning which the inscription might have for him could be communicable to another.¹

The missile was placed in his hands. Could he now say what the words upon it signified.

That, Monsieur thought, might be done in a century or so. The words were 'night and day.' 'Night' suggested much: the closing of shops, the slumber of the respectable, the silences and the noises of the night, the swing of great bodies through the sky, the activity of those things which had rested through the heat of the day, and above all the growth of the superb exception—the mushroom that had proved the ruler!

Should he speak of the 'day'? Not until he had spoken of the great conjunction—the amazing 'and' that held 'night' and 'day' together, and bound them in a circle about the earth. How gigantic a conjunction! which in commerce joined the obvious to the mysterious: the man to his company!

Remove 'and' from the world, and the marriage-tie would be broken; cheques would remain uncrossed; and a chasm would open, upon either side of which should stand for ever Biscuit and Walrus, Carpenter and Cheese! But transcending all this was the extraordinary fact that 'and' might be made to illustrate a great philosophic truth: 'and' bound together, without touching the things which it joined; and was not this the glorious principle which it had been Monsieur's privilege to apprehend: the law of the Mushroom—Unity without Contact!

And who could speak of all that 'day' suggested, without a shudder or a smile? Blinds were raised; the doors of virtue opened; the stars swept from the sky; the magnet of the Metropolis once more charged with its diabolic

¹ Dr. Sully makes Monsieur's position clear enough for our purpose when he defines a concept as 'the representation in our mind answering to a general name.' But 'what is in the mind is a kind of composite image formed by the fusion or coalescence of many images of single objects.' As the Idealist denies that the *noumenon* can be apprehended by us; naturally the transmission of a subjective and imperfect appreciation of an object (whose existence was denied) to the probably non-existent mind of another was impossible.—*Outlines of Psychology*, Dr. Sully, chap. x.

power to wrest the workman from his wife, the pauper from the provinces, the ice-cream seller from the Ionian Sea ; that for another ' day ' the great world-engine should grind and groan. And so there would be a blaze and blister of heat, until the mushroom demanded darkness, and ' night ' came at its call, so that the ' great exception ' should express itself unseen.

It was intimated politely to Monsieur that, patient though the Committee were, they would prefer that he should, if possible, express for them the meaning of the words upon which, individually, he had treated with considerable eloquence. The Chairman, indeed, ventured to declare that Monsieur was ' strangely sane ' ; and that his remarks ' betrayed a grasp of logic ' which, though ' put to extravagant use,' nevertheless, led one to believe that Monsieur's reasoning powers were normal. But why this intrusion of the mushroom ? Monsieur's sense of humour should preserve him ' from crowning all his logical processes with the head of His Most Martyred Majesty ! '

This carefully-prepared impromptu was greeted with almost violent appreciation.

Monsieur at once appealed to the Committee to confirm his opinion that the Chairman alone was guilty of intruding King Charles's head. He, Monsieur, indeed reduced all things to mushrooms because he had discovered that all things could be so reduced ; and he was free from criticism until those who desired to question his statement had studied the subject as deeply as he himself had done. Monsieur's introduction of the mushroom was perfectly legitimate. The Chairman, on the other hand, had clearly been unable to suppress his somewhat ambiguous reference to the deceased king. And his veiling of the metaphor indicated, so far as Monsieur could judge, a struggle of some standing. Monsieur suspected that the Chairman had at some time or other made a mental compact with himself to suppress the direct and hackneyed reference ; and if unable to refrain, simply to put forth some pleasing though inclusive expression of the thought.

The Chairman with extraordinary gravity, which contrasted curiously with the laughter of his colleagues, informed Monsieur that he could afford to ignore any analysis from so prejudiced and questionable a quarter. Monsieur must attend to the matter in hand. Did he, or did he not, know the meaning of the words 'Night and day'?

After some consideration, Monsieur declared that, speaking as a Philologist——

Amid much noise and laughter Monsieur was informed that the Committee had no occasion to be instructed in Philology, nor had it any desire to be instructed at that exact moment by Monsieur. The question was simple. It remained to be answered.

After some consideration, Monsieur declared that, speaking as a lover of Logic, he objected that the question proposed was exclusive of what he was generous enough to suppose the Committee desired. They had asked for the meaning of the words. Was he, then, to conclude that they desired to ascertain the actual meaning which the words possessed when inscribed upon the head of the masquerader on this particular occasion?

That was it! Exactly to the point! The Committee unanimously congratulated Monsieur on his discernment and the lucidity of his expression.

At this Monsieur appeared much distressed. It was painful to disappoint earnest seekers after truth. But how, he appealed to them, how, in fairness, could they expect him to attach a meaning to words inscribed upon a mushroom in masquerade that had penetrated the silk hat of a Chairman of Committee? The Chairman had clearly broken the communication. How should a mushroom grown from a silk hat have the same value as a mushroom grown in a field? Monsieur would venture upon the thin ice of no hypothesis. By accepting the inscription upon a masquerader, so strikingly presented to consciousness,¹ he might become blind to the great truths

¹ I am in a position to say that Monsieur quite appreciated the complex metaphysical situation with which he tries to deal. The problem is simply

which it was his joy to discover in the genuine mushroom. And there the matter must end. How, Monsieur asked, by way of excuse, could he be certain that the Chairman had not placed the masquerader in his own hat, possibly as a relief to his feelings!

At this there was an uproar; but when silence became a possibility Monsieur appealed to the Committee to call to mind what he had said about the Chairman's weakness. Had they heard a similar reference to King Charles' head before?

Certainly not.

'But,' Monsieur pleaded, 'you cannot know with what subtlety he may have disguised it. For observe, in this instance, except for certain local associations, the metaphor could have been applied with equal force to a King of France!'

After that Monsieur was dismissed, and the Chairman put to some pains to exclude an unfortunate reference to himself on the minutes of the Committee. There were some, however, who voted for the inclusion of those parts to which he offered objection, on account of their possessing much value as evidence of the mental processes of a lunatic.

Monsieur's tactless treatment of the Chairman was quite possibly responsible for his continued detention. The Chairman, indeed, possessing a taste for the delicacies of language, relished what Monsieur had said at the commencement of the inquisition, and allowed himself to suppose that before him there stood a patient and persecuted philosopher. It should be clear, therefore, that if Monsieur had been satisfied to accept—as all wise men accept—the meaning clearly intended for the meaning actually expressed, in place of crushing the Chairman unkindly, he might have been released.

one for the psychologist; and I am assured that he had in his mind a somewhat conservative definition of the science, i.e.: 'Psychology is the science of those processes whereby the individual becomes aware of a world of objects around him, and adjusts his actions accordingly.'—*Manual of Psychology*, Stout, chap. i.

The Chairman had reason to understand that ridicule is never so exquisitely acid as when it comes to be delivered from the dock. And Monsieur obtained at least a prize to console him when he gained the knowledge that it is never safe to joke at the expense of one's judge. But he had apparently neglected to learn that retaliation should be undertaken only by the strong.

'The worm,' he said to one of his keepers, as he left the room of Committee, 'that turns should prepare for eternity !'

The picture, as we see it, is sad : Monsieur so near to liberty, yet not released. His believers preparing to welcome him at the prison gate, and sent back scowling and sorrowful to their work upon the wall ; tearing, as they go, the laurel coronet that it might the better resemble a palm of martyrdom ; for information as to the progress of the inquisition had been conveyed at intervals to them by a servant of the Asylum.

Monsieur, it appeared, had not suspected how near he had come to the sweets of slavery ; so, when he was led from before the Committee, he returned with haste to the plantation of puff-balls. The unwearied attentions of the philosopher had somewhat reduced the number of dust-globes. And as the days passed, Monsieur found himself in possession of much powder ; until at length he considered that he might be contented with what his bag contained. Then it was that he strayed, with the bag in his arms, towards the boundary wall ; and presently he wrenched a great cake of fungus from the arms of a low-built sycamore, and with a swing, tossed it over the wall. A vigorous oath might be offered as evidence that it struck a watcher in the outer world ; but that is unimportant. The fact upon which it becomes necessary to concentrate our attention is that a scaling-ladder was suddenly shot over the wall, and lowered at Monsieur's feet. And when the slowly-working wits of the keepers had digested the

objective reality¹ of this apparition, Monsieur was already almost out of reach. And when they darted forward to claim the calves of his legs, the very sky seemed to split, and the sand of some celestial desert to descend upon them. Also there was something in this dust which appeared to penetrate their souls, and make pity, for a time, one of their emotions; so that when they struggled from the stupor of sympathy, Monsieur was already upon his feet in the outer world,² waving an empty bag as the ritualists of the 'ring' are wont to wave the towels of triumph.

A. NEWMAN.

¹ It might be argued that the men were in no way to blame. 'Nothing,' says Whittaker of Schopenhauer, 'can exceed his scorn for everything that characterised the Middle Ages.' And as Schopenhauer viewed that period for its philosophical worth, the claim of the Schoolmen that it was possible to apprehend a real world outside ourselves, within obvious limits, causes his condemnation to fall upon them. And the keepers might have quoted Schopenhauer in their defence.

² I have documents in my possession which are evidence regarding Monsieur's conduct and investigations after he regained his freedom. He lived for some time under the protection of the keeper of a plant nursery, who had become so enthusiastic a believer in the doctrine of the Mushroom that he painted his glass-houses with a black light-excluding fluid, and cultivated the mushroom reverently. A primitive worship had already developed when Monsieur was restored to his followers. I have reason to believe that he prepared to encourage this, and, in some respects to modify it. But the world interfered. There is a journal before me which records frequent attacks upon the glass-houses; and there are references to search parties from the Asylum. I am enabled to trace the purchase of a sailing ship by the keeper of the plant nursery, and the embarkation of Monsieur and his followers upon this ship, the hold of which contained mushroom-spore bricks. After that, I have no reliable evidence. In *Merchgoldt's Diary*, however, there occurs a passage which I quote without comment:—

'At lat. 140, long. 20, we sighted a small island, which seemed a place where pure water might be found. The water was good; but with the exception of mushroom and fungus growths of all kinds, there was no vegetation. Some of the mushroom growths were the largest I have ever seen; and several of them bore an absurd resemblance to human faces. I took several photos.' One of the photographs, which I have seen, bears an extraordinary likeness to Monsieur.

PRIMATE REGINALD OF ARMAGH

By REV. M. H. MACINERNEY, O.P.

II

THE record of Reginald's career from 1218 to 1237, so far as documentary evidence goes, is more than distressingly meagre ; it is an absolute blank. No contemporary gleaner, no writer of history, from the thirteenth century to the seventeenth, has chosen to tell us anything of Reginald's activities during that large interval of nineteen years. Tradition of a sort, it is true, represents him as leading the first colony of Dominicans into Ireland in the year 1224. This tradition, which often masquerades in the garb of sober historical fact, is vague in character and late in origin ; it seems to be based mainly upon inference and conjecture. Father Fontana, an Italian Dominican of acknowledged eminence, whose *Sacrum Theatrum Dominicanum*, so often quoted by De Burgo, saw the light in 1666, while his *Monumenta Dominicana* was published in 1675, appears to have been the first author of this unreliable tradition.

Knowing that Reginald had been one of the early disciples of St. Dominic, and that he afterwards sat in the primatial chair of Armagh, Fontana suggested, with some positiveness, that he might have been a member of the first band of Dominicans who set foot on Irish shores. Worse still, he coupled Reginald's supposed Irish mission with St. Dominic's apocryphal letter to the O'Donnells of Tyrconnell.¹ To quote the quaint English of Stevens, Fontana

believes that Reginald, who was one of the Saint's companions, repair'd to the famous O'Donnells in the Province of Ulster, from

¹ De Burgo, *Hib. Dom.*, p. 39. In this connexion, Fontana offers the still more ridiculous suggestion that St. Dominic himself came to Ireland

St. Dominick, who by his Letters recommended his Order to them, and that those Irish Noblemen immediately caus'd a fine Monastery of Dominicans to be built in the Town of Londonderry; but the Historians of that Order not assigning the Time of the Foundation of this House before the Year 1274, it is so far from being the first of that Order in Ireland, that there were several others before it, for I find ten or twelve built about the beginning of the thirteenth century. As for instance, that of Dublin is ancients, for it was built in the Year 1224, being the beginning of the same century.¹

Nobody believes, nowadays, in the genuineness of St. Dominic's alleged letter to the O'Donnells of Donegal; but the picture of Reginald, as an Irishman, leading the first group of Dominicans who came to this country, has haunted the imagination of many writers. Fontana's surmise was speedily transformed into ascertained fact. Quite a number of modern writers assure us, as though the matter admitted of no doubt whatever, that when St. Dominic sent his apostolic colony of Dominicans to England in 1221, Reginald was one of their company; that three years later he crossed over to Ireland at the head of an adventurous group of missionaries; and finally, that after founding several priories in this country, he retired to Rome, where he was raised to the office of Papal Penitentiary. All this may be absolutely true, and it is the accepted story. But unfortunately it receives no confirmation from contemporary or sub-contemporary writings. So far as I can ascertain, this pleasing legend was never heard of until four hundred years after Primate Reginald

and became the founder of a church in Ossory. As Alemand and Stevens rightly point out, the only saint of the name identified with Ossory is St. Modhonnoc, who is sometimes called St. Dominicus in Latin, and who was an Irish saint of the sixth century. (See an account of him in Carrigan's *Ossory*, iv. pp. 225-6.) So that Fontana's blunder involves an anachronism of some seven centuries.

¹ Stevens, *Monasticon Hibernicum*, London, 1722, p. 206. This passage from Stevens is an almost literal translation from L. Aug. Alemand, *Histoire Monastique d'Irlande*, Paris, 1690, p. 199. Stevens' whole work is avowedly a translation from Alemand, with several additions by the translator, who was a devoted antiquarian. Alemand's book is a very handy compendium of Irish monastic history; it is far from deserving the systematic disparagement heaped upon it by O'Heyne. If enlarged, re-written, and thoroughly brought up to date, it might still furnish a highly serviceable introduction to the literature of the subject.

had been laid in his grave. The first settlement of the Dominicans in Ireland is recorded by sundry chroniclers, but Reginald is impartially passed over in silence by all chroniclers, whether native or foreign, from the time of the Bologna miracle until the death of Blessed Jordan of Saxony in 1237.

A brief statement of the sequence of events may be in place here. At the second general chapter of Bologna in 1221, presided over by St. Dominic himself, it was found that sixty Dominican priories existed in various countries, while many more were in course of erection. To cope with this rapid and flourishing development, and with a view to greater convenience of administration, the Order was now divided into eight 'provinces,' whereof England was one. The entire institute was placed upon a thoroughly democratic basis. Each province, and each house within the province, was to enjoy the fullest measure of local autonomy compatible with observance of a common rule.¹ No Dominican foundation as yet existed in England; but Father Gilbert de Freynet, with twelve companions, whose names are not recorded, was immediately dispatched to that country. Arriving at Canterbury, in June, 1221, two months before St. Dominic's demise, they received a cordial welcome from the great Archbishop, Stephen Langton, the father of Magna Charta, who was so greatly edified by a sermon of Gilbert's that he ever afterwards bore a special affection for the Dominicans. On the feast of Our Lady's Assumption, Gilbert and his companions settled at Oxford, where they began St. Edward's School, and soon flourished exceedingly.²

Many notable University men joined their ranks at this time. John of St. Giles, who was already a Master in

¹ See *The Dominican Order and Convocation*, by Ernest Barker, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, 1913, *passim*. In this luminous study Mr. Barker lays stress on the essentially democratic spirit in which the constitution and legislation of the Order were conceived. He shows how these democratic ideas gradually spread to the Franciscans and others, influenced the secular clergy, and eventually leavened both Convocation and Parliament.

² Trivet, *Annales*, ad an. 1221; Drane, *History of St. Dominic*, pp. 441-442; Barker, *The Dominican Order and Convocation*, p. 28.

Theology when he assumed the Dominican habit, in the midst of a sermon on poverty, was the first professor in the School of St. Edward. A man of ripe knowledge and varied experience, he had lectured in Montpellier as well as at Paris. Trivet describes him as *Suavissimus moralizator* and also *in arte medicinae expertissimus*; while even Matthew Paris, assuredly no friendly critic, admits his medical skill. John of St. Giles was an intimate friend of Robert Grosseteste, the great Bishop of Lincoln, and is frequently mentioned in the letters of that famous prelate.¹

Robert Bacon, a Dominican kinsman and namesake of the more famous Roger Bacon, was himself a man of great parts. He was the devoted friend and companion of Richard Fitzacker or Fishacre, renowned in his day as a commentator on the *Sentences*. Fitzacker is extolled by Ireland as 'the most learned among the learned'; and Anthony à Wood attests that 'he was renowned both as a philosopher and as a divine.' Robert Kilwardby was perhaps the most remarkable member of this early group of English Dominicans. A prolific author of the old Augustinian and pre-Thomist school, he wrote on Aristotle's *Organon* (including the Prior and Posterior Analytics); on Aristotle's physical and metaphysical writings (including the *De Anima*); on Priscian; on the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard; on the unity of forms, on the origin and division of knowledge, and on the nature of relation. Kilwardby's treatise on the origin and division of knowledge has been styled 'the most important introduction to philosophy of the Middle Ages.' He eventually became Archbishop of Canterbury, and ranks as the first of England's Dominican Cardinals.²

In 1224 the first band of Dominicans reached Dublin, and established themselves at St. Saviour's Church, on the site where the Four Courts now stand. In the same year

¹ Trivet, *Annales*, ad an. 1222; M. Paris, *Hist. Anglorum*, Rolls edit., iii. 145; Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 30; *Letters of Bishop Grosseteste*, ed. Luard, *passim*.

² Barker, *The Dominican Order and Convocation*, p. 30; Drane, *Hist. of St. Dominic*, pp. 442, 443.

they also founded a priory in Drogheda, thanks to the munificence of Luke Netterville, Primate of Armagh. In 1225 the celebrated Black Abbey of Kilkenny was built for them by William Marshal the younger, Earl of Pembroke and Earl-Marshal of England. In 1226 a Dominican settlement was effected in Waterford, where, nine years later, the citizens erected a church and priory for the Fathers, on a vacant site granted by Henry III. In 1227 the priory of Limerick was founded, largely through the generosity of Donogh Cairbreach O'Brien, Prince of Thomond. Finally, in 1229, the priory of Cork was built for Dominicans by the liberality of Philip de Barry. A period of eight years now elapsed before the founding of Mullingar Priory, which took place in 1237, and is variously credited to the Petits, the Nugents, and the Bishop of Meath. During this period we might reasonably place Reginald's return to Rome, if the story of his Irish mission were really reliable. We might suppose him to have retired from Ireland in 1230, or a few years later, after witnessing the foundation of six houses of his Order in this island, which some have regarded as his native land.

Fancies such as these, however, must be dismissed to the limbo of uncertain things. Mamachi very sensibly says of Reginald (whom he also calls Raynaldus) that 'as to his nationality, or his family, or the events of his youth, nothing of a certain and definite character can be set down. For we must not give credence to recent historians when they cannot adduce any testimony from ancient and approved writers in favour of their opinion.' This shaft may well have been aimed at Fontana and Echard for their plausible but unsupported conjectures regarding Primate Reginald. 'The fame of Raynaldus,' adds Mamachi, 'and the memory of his noble deeds, have been obliterated in great part by the ravages of time. Still, it is clear that he was a good and learned man, graced with many honours.'¹

¹ 'De ejus patria, parentibus, rebusque in adolescentia gestis nihil certi definitique afferri potest. Non enim fidendum historicis novis est, qui nulla veterum, probatorumque scriptorum testimonia ad suam confirmandam sen-

In 1237 we are once more on solid ground. In that year we find Reginald notifying the Paris community of the death of Blessed Jordan, the holy and lovable General of the Order, who was drowned off the Anatolian coast on February 23, 1237. The sad intelligence was communicated by Fathers Godfrey and Reginald, penitentiaries of the Pope, in a letter to the Dominicans of Paris, written very probably from Viterbo, where the Pontiff remained with his court from March until September of that year.² This letter, from its quaint, old-world style, does not easily bear translation, but some idea of its contents may be gleaned from the following version :—

To their venerable and beloved brethren, the prior and community of Paris, Brothers Godfrey and Reginald, penitentiaries of our lord the Pope, wish health and consolation from the Holy Spirit.—Be it known to you, that the galley which bore our dearest father, Master Jordan, and two of the brethren, was driven ashore by a violent storm ; and he, with ninety-nine [*al.* twenty-nine] other persons, perished in the waves, and so passed away from this wicked world. Let not your hearts be dismayed on this account, dear friends, for our Heavenly Father, the God of all consolation, has provided for His orphaned children a tranquil refuge after the storm. While their bodies lay unburied, lights from heaven shone above them night after night, as is attested by those who escaped from the shipwreck, and who buried them with their own hands. Numerous crosses were also seen above them by many persons. Attracted by these miraculous appearances, crowds of people gathered to the spot, and perceived an odour of wonderful fragrance. Those who witnessed these miracles, and who afterwards buried the three bodies, declare that for ten succeeding days a delightful odour exhaled from their hands. Round about the

tentiam recitant. . . . Raynaldi laudes, resque praeclare gestas, vetustas injuriaque temporum magnam partem delevit. Nihilominus virum bonum, doctum, magnisque ornatum honoribus fuisse constat' (Mamachi, *Annales Ord. Præd.*, Romæ, 1756, pp. 601-602). Mamachi fails to distinguish between St. Dominic's two miracles at Bologna, and obviously imagines that the Saint multiplied bread only once in that city. Citing Gerard de Frachet to show that Reginald was present at a miracle wrought in Bologna by the holy founder, and having the sound authority of Taegio for asserting that St. Dominic multiplied bread at Bologna in 1220, Mamachi draws the natural but erroneous conclusion that Reginald was a witness of the miracle of 1220, and that he must have entered the Order about that year. The truth, as I have endeavoured to show, is that Reginald was present at the Mascarella miracle of 1218.

² *Calendar of Papal Registers*, i. pp. 160-166.

burial place, for a considerable distance, a similar odour of sweetness was observed. This continued until our brethren came from Acre [Ptolemais] in a boat, and translated the three bodies to their own church, where the said Father now reposes, bestowing many benefits upon many people. Blessed be God in all things. Amen.¹

The circumstances of Blessed Jordan's death were made known to Gregory IX in a letter from Father Philip, then Provincial of the Dominicans in the Holy Land. The facts thus became known to the two Dominican penitentiaries residing at the papal court, and they hastened to forward the sad but glorious news to Paris, and doubtless to other centres of the Order. Such, at least, is the theory of Echard, and its reasonableness can scarcely be called in question, though it gains little support from the passage on which he relies. Fontana and Mortier represent Reginald and his brother-penitentiary as being in Syria at the time²; but this view is rejected as erroneous by Echard, and with good reason, for it has hardly a particle of evidence in its favour. Besides, we cannot well suppose that two Papal penitentiaries, both Dominicans, were simultaneously absent

¹ *Vitæ Fratrum*, ed. Reichert, pp. 130, 329. Echard rightly notes that the Bollandists (*Acta SS.*, Februar. 13, p. 730) have adopted a faulty reading of one clause in this letter. They substitute *Galilææ* for *galeam*, thus making it appear that Blessed Jordan was drowned off the coast of Galilee, whereas we know from Gerard de Frachet that he was drowned in the gulf of Adalia (also called Satalieh and Satalaya), on the southern coast of Asia Minor. Besides, the bulk of manuscript authority is altogether in favour of *galeam*, and against the Bollandist reading. A *galea*, according to Ducange, was a species of very fast sailing vessel. The gulf of Adalia, in which Blessed Jordan met his death, is a deep and broad indentation on the coast of Anatolia, being about 100 miles in width at its entrance, and 50 in length. The town of Adalia stands at the head of the gulf, 'pleasantly situated on the slope of a hill rising to a height of 70 feet above the level of the sea. The houses being built circularly round the harbour, the streets appear to rise behind each other, like the seats of a theatre. There is a bazaar, or collection of shops, where various articles of European manufacture are displayed. The neighbourhood abounds with orange, lemon, fig, and mulberry trees, with vines, sugar canes, etc.; and the view from the higher houses is said to be very fine, the country being fertile and the mountains "poetically beautiful." In the town are fragments of ancient buildings, columns, inscriptions, and statues, which are generally built into the walls of the town with care and some taste. Adalia is begirt with a double wall. Scarcely a ship rides in the ancient harbour, a few boats occupying a port which, in early ages, contained its fleet. A stream in the neighbourhood is supposed to have been the ancient *Catarractes*.'—Blackie's *Imperial Gazetteer*, 1876, vol. i. p. 24.

² Fontana, *Sacrum Theatrum Dominicanum*, p. 471; Mortier, *Hist. des Maîtres Généraux*, i. p. 251.

from their duties at the pontifical court, and that they happened to be simultaneously residing or sojourning in Syria; such a supposition is distinctly improbable. But it is quite possible that Reginald and Godfrey, while discharging their duties at the papal court, may have been in direct communication with Father Philip and the Dominicans of Acre, who would naturally hasten to inform them of Blessed Jordan's fate.

After this, Reginald disappears from view for a further period of ten years. From 1237 until 1247 he, no doubt, remained at his post, exhorting and absolving sinners, and earning golden opinions from those who knew him best. Very probably he had to follow the successive peregrinations of the Pontiff's court, from Viterbo to Rome, thence to Anagni, on more than one occasion, and finally to Lyons, in December, 1244.¹ Meanwhile, Pope Gregory IX, the friend and admirer of St. Dominic and St. Francis, had passed to his reward on August 21, 1241; and from June, 1243, Pope Innocent IV reigned in his stead. When the Pope fled in disguise from Sutri, during the night of June 27-28, 1244, and hastened over the mountains to Civita Vecchia, Reginald may possibly have been a sharer in his hardships, journeying with him to Genoa, and ultimately to Lyons.

The General Council of Lyons was held in June and July, 1245. It was attended by Primate Albert Suerbeer, of Armagh, who had lately incurred the fierce resentment of Henry III, by daring to appeal to the Holy See for a fair judgment in his dispute with the litigious Prior of Llanthony. Henry III, with his insufferable ecclesiastical pretensions, was a most disagreeable monarch to live under. Like Joseph II of Austria, he had a penchant for perpetual interference in Church affairs. Generally involved in a conflict with some prelate or other, he quarrelled with most of the Irish Bishops of his time. The four Irish Archbishops, whether of Irish or foreign extraction,

¹ *Calendar of Papal Registers*, i. pp. 162-210.

had grievous reason to complain, one after another, of the misdeeds of Henry and his subordinates. In one thing Henry was steadily consistent : he was ever striving, by aggression and encroachment, to extend his power over the Irish Church and to strangle its liberties.

Primate Albert had incurred his unmeasured wrath by submitting the Llanthony lawsuit to an impartial tribunal at the papal court, instead of allowing it to be tried by Henry's subservient judges. We shall presently have occasion to quote a royal letter, which was addressed to certain ecclesiastical judges in Ireland, ordering them to decide in accordance with the pretensions of the Crown, and warning them that certain litigants would be mulcted in heavy penalties by the Crown if a decision were rendered in their favour. If the English Crown could thus dictate to an independent body of ecclesiastical judges, it would have still less hesitation in bringing pressure to bear upon secular judges, who were merely its own officials. In such circumstances the independence of the judicial bench was a mockery and a sham ; Primate Albert could have little confidence in the impartiality of such tribunals. Realising the hopelessness of trying to administer a diocese under so despotic and capricious a potentate as Henry III, Albert resigned the Archbishopric of Armagh shortly after the General Council of 1245.

Towards the end of April in the following year Henry III essayed to forestall the Pope, by hurriedly filling the Armagh vacancy ere Innocent IV should have time to appoint a nominee of his own. Henry's agents had informed their master of the Pope's intentions, and immediate action was deemed necessary. The Irish Justiciary was ordered to expedite the Armagh election ; the Canons of that diocese were simply to apply to the Justiciary for licence to elect, which was to be immediately granted, and the royal assent was to be given without delay to the election thus made.

Having learnt that the Pope intends by all means to ordain to the Archbishopric of Armagh, the King gives power to John Fitz

Geoffrey, Justiciary of Ireland, in lieu of the King, to grant to the Chapter of that church licence to elect, and to assent to the election. Mandate to the Justiciary to take security by letters patent from the Chapter that this course shall not hereafter tend to the King's prejudice.—The Chapter is instructed to demand licence to elect from the Justiciary.¹

Shortly afterwards, the petition of the Chapter reached the King himself, being probably drafted some weeks before June 4, 1246. It is thus summarised: '[] Dean, G. Archpriest, M. Chancellor, R. Precentor, and all the Chapter of Armagh to the King, praying licence to elect an Archbishop in the room of A[lbert], who had resigned on being translated to another diocese by special licence of the Pope.'² The licence was speedily granted to Canons Reginald and Thomas, who had been sent over from Armagh to the King at Windsor. Under date of June 4, 1246, we read: 'For the Dean and Chapter of Armagh. Licence by Reginald and Thomas, Canons of that church, to elect a Bishop.'³

But the plot miscarried, and Henry was foiled. The Armagh Canons fell at variance among themselves, and the affair had perforce to be referred to the Holy See. The Chancellor of the diocese and some of the Canons proceeded to hold an election, without notifying the other members of the Chapter who had a legal right to be invited. Against this irregular procedure a protest was lodged by Master Andrew, the Archdeacon, but without avail. The Chancellor and his friends elected Bishop Giolla-in-Coimded O'Cairellan, otherwise known as Gervase or Germanus O'Carolan, an excellent prelate who had for some time ruled the see of Derry, which was then officially known as Rathluraigh (Maghera). The election, of course, was irregular and illegal. The Archdeacon reported the entire transaction to Innocent IV, at the same time suggesting a strong doubt as to Bishop O'Carolan's fitness to rule the Primatial See. In consequence of these representations

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1171-1251*, p. 423.

² *Ibid.*, p. 435. This entry is misplaced and wrongly dated in the *Calendar*.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 423.

Innocent IV issued a commission on October 8, 1246, to the Dominican Prior of Drogheda and the Franciscan Guardian of Dundalk, instructing and empowering them to cite Bishop Germanus and his supporters, the former to appear personally, the latter by proxy, before the Pontiff, at Lyons, by next Laetare Sunday. The faulty summary of this mandate in the *Calendar of Papal Registers* may be here given in a somewhat corrected form :—

Mandate to the Prior of the Friars Preachers of Drogheda and the Guardian of the Friars Minors of Dundalk, in the diocese of Armagh, on the information of Master Andrew, Archdeacon of Armagh, to cite Master M., Chancellor of that church, and his abettors, together with Germanus, Bishop of Rathlure, whom they presumed to postulate for the church of Armagh in the absence of the Canons, and after appeal made. Bishop Germanus is to appear in person, and his postulators by proctors, before next Laetare Sunday, to receive the Pope's decision as to the postulation; but if they are unwilling to pursue the postulation, they are to send some of their fellow-Canons to receive the Pope's award.¹

Under the year 1246, the *Annals of Ulster* state that the Bishop of Rathluraigh was chosen to be Archbishop of Armagh, but they give no hint of the irregularities which vitiated his election. In due course the election was voided, and we may regard Laetare Sunday, March 10, 1247, as the approximate date of its annulment. Reginald, who had won the high esteem of Innocent IV, was soon appointed to the Primatial See and duly consecrated. The *Annals of Ulster*, confusing Rome with Lyons, as many later authorities have likewise done, inform us that in 1247, 'Raighned was instituted into the Archbishopric of Ard-Macha in Rome.'

Great prelates were accustomed in those days to journey by easy stages. On October 28, 1247, we find Primate Reginald in London; a document preserved among the muniments of Westminster Abbey shows that he was in

¹ *Cal. Pap. Reg.*, i. p. 228. For Dr. B. MacCarthy's observations on this passage of the *Calendar*, see I. E. RECORD, 1895, p. 342. The mandate is published in full by Theiner, p. 45. Bishop O'Carolan's Christian name, Giollan-Coimded, means 'Servant of the Lord.'

the English capital on that day. This document is of interest to theologians; it is a grant of indulgence to all who should duly venerate the supposed relics of the Sacred Blood, which Henry had brought to Westminster a fortnight earlier, on the feast of the translation of St. Edward the Confessor (October 13). Reginald's grant reveals not only his deep piety but also his eagerness to conciliate the English King:—

Brother Reynard,¹ by Divine condescension, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, to all the faithful of Christ, whom he much loves, eternal salvation in the Lord. Desiring to gain souls for God as far as lies in our power, and thus to fulfil the duty of our pontifical office, we invite all the faithful of Christ, by means of such attractive gifts as indulgences and remissions, to venerate in a special manner the relics of the Saviour of us all, Who assumed flesh for our sakes in the Virgin's womb, and poured forth His own Blood on the gibbet of the Cross, that He might overcome the wickedness of the ancient serpent and liberate the human race from the jaws of death. Therefore, we rejoice in the Lord and exult in our inmost heart, at the zeal and devotion to God's service of the most Christian prince, our lord H[enry], by the grace of God, the illustrious King of the English. Confiding in the mercy of Almighty God, and in the merits of His glorious Virgin Mother and of all the Saints, we hereby grant to all true penitents who have confessed their sins, a remission of forty days out of the penance imposed upon them, provided that they visit and duly venerate the relics of the Most Precious Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, transmitted by our venerable father . . . the Patriarch of Jerusalem to the most serene prince above named.—London, 5 Kalends of November, in the fifth year of the pontificate of the lord Pope Innocent IV [Oct. 28, 1247].

An echo of these incidents may be found in the pages of Matthew Paris, under date of October 13, in the following year:—

The King declared and ordered proclamation to be made throughout the city of London and elsewhere that he established a new fair, to be held in Westminster for a full fortnight. He also strictly prohibited, under pain of heavy forfeiture and loss,

¹ So the name is given in Wilkins' *Concilia*, i. p. 696, but I doubt if it has been correctly copied from the original.

all fairs, which usually lasted for such a length of time in England, and also all traffic, which is usually carried on in London, both in and out of doors, that the Westminster fair might have a better attendance of people and be better supplied with merchandise. Whence it came to pass that numerous people flocked thither as to the most frequented fair, and the translation of St. Edward was celebrated, and the Blood of Christ worshipped to an unexpected degree by the people gathered and assembled there.¹

Primate Reginald's indulgence doubtless did its share in stimulating popular devotion on this occasion. Meanwhile, by a curious coincidence, the very day which witnessed Reginald's grant of indulgences witnessed also the restoration of his temporalities. On October 28, 1247, the new Primate of Armagh, who had just paid his homage to Henry III at Westminster, received custody of the revenues of his see. 'The Archbishop of Armagh having rendered fealty, the King commands John FitzGeoffrey, Justiciary of Ireland, to give him seisin of all the lands and possessions of the see.'²

Three months later Henry III bestowed upon Primate Reginald a fresh mark of his royal favour, in the form of a gift of money, equivalent to £400 in modern currency. The order for this donation was signed at Westminster on January 29, 1248, and it seems very probable that Reginald at that time was still in London. Be this as it may, Henry III issued a 'mandate to the Justiciary of Ireland to cause the Archbishop of Armagh to have out of the issues of the King's Irish land 40 marks of the King's gift.'³ This benefaction must have been highly acceptable to Reginald, whom Providence had suddenly raised from the status of a poor friar to that of an exalted prelate. He had obviously made a very favourable impression upon the mind of Henry III, and had speedily won the good graces of that monarch. This must have been a feat of peculiar difficulty, in view of the humiliating failure of Henry's

¹ M. Paris, vol. v. p. 29; cf. *The Misrule of Henry III*, by Rev. W. H. Hutton, M.A., p. 121—a bitterly anti-papal manual.

² *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1171-1251*, p. 435.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 436.

plans with reference to Armagh. Reginald had unwittingly been, in large measure, the instrument of Henry's discomfiture. When Innocent IV, early in 1246, determined to fill the Armagh see by a prelate of his own choosing, it is very probable that he had fixed upon Reginald as the future Primate. Reginald was thus the ecclesiastic whose elevation Henry III had vainly striven to thwart; and he might expect to feel the full force of the King's resentment. It speaks volumes for Reginald's sweetness, holiness, and tact, that he was so soon able to change Henry's enmity into friendliness; indeed, it is creditable alike to the King and the Primate that their early relations were marked by so much good feeling and mutual appreciation.

The annalists, with great unanimity, assign Reginald's arrival in Ireland to the year 1248. In that year, as the *Annals of Loch Cé* affirm, 'the comarb of Patrick, i.e., the poenitentiarius of the Pope, came to Erinn.' The Four Masters inform us that 'Raighned, Archbishop of Armagh, came from Rome, bringing with him the pallium, in which he said Mass at Armagh on the festival of SS. Peter and Paul'¹—which fell on Monday, June 29, in the year 1248. Here, as in many instances of a similar kind, the term 'Rome' is loosely employed to designate the papal court, which then *de facto* happened to be at Lyons. The entry in the *Annals of Ulster* hardly differs in any respect from that of the Four Masters, except that Reginald's name is given as Raighnedh. Sir James Ware represents the new Primate as coming direct to Armagh in June, 1247, immediately after his consecration; but the authority of the annalists is against this view. Besides, we know that Reginald was in London in October, 1247, which, in those days of slow travel, seems inconsistent with the theory that he had taken up his residence at Armagh in the

¹ O'Donovan, in a note on this passage, avers that the Primate's 'real name was Reiner,' adding that his 'surname or country has not yet been determined.' Hennessy's note on the corresponding entry in the *Annals of Loch Cé* asserts that the Primate's name 'should be Regnier or Reiner.' That his contemporaries knew him as Reginald, has been abundantly shown in these pages.

preceding June. It is unlikely that, so soon after entering upon his diocesan duties, he would have left his diocese in order to undertake a fresh journey. We may regard it as practically certain that he tarried in London until his temporalities were restored, and that he even prolonged his stay at the English Court until the early part of 1248.¹

On his arrival in Armagh, Reginald must have found awaiting him an order from the Pope to provide a benefice for an Italian cleric named Tedisio di Lavagna, probably some friend or dependent of Innocent IV, who was Count of Lavagna in his own right. This is one of the relatively few instances of the collation of an Italian ecclesiastic to an Irish benefice, and the motives which prompted the Pope's action are not without interest.

As the Apostolic See, like a loving mother [wrote Innocent IV, in this mandate of February 13, 1248], has been accustomed at times to make liberal provision for externs and persons unknown, so also should her munificence be extended to those whose devotedness she well knows. In proportion as the fidelity of her ministers is proved by experience so much the more largely should she reward their merits. Hence, as we intend to confer a special favour upon our beloved son, Master Thedisius de Lavania, cleric and pontifical writer, in reward for his faithfulness and integrity, we command you, by virtue of our authority, to provide him, in person or by proxy, with a prebend or other ecclesiastical benefice of a suitable nature, even with cure of souls, in one of the churches of your province, if any such benefice be now vacant, or as soon as opportunity may arise; and we declare the collation of such benefice, otherwise than in accordance with this mandate, to be wholly null and void.²

¹ Adopting Ware's mistaken date, and misled by his own Erastian prejudices, Harris would have us believe that Reginald was elected by the clergy of Armagh, that he journeyed thence to Rome for consecration, and returned to Armagh in June, 1247. This groundless theory needs no refutation; but Harris's passage, with its profusion of capitals, may be cited: 'It seems the King having had Intelligence, that the Pope designed to dispose of this Archbishoprick by Provision, was resolved to be beforehand with him; and therefore issued a Commission to the Lords Justices of Ireland, Authorizing them to grant his Licence (without any application to him in England) to the Dean and Chapter to elect a Primate, and at the same Time to give his Consent to such Election; but directed the Justices to take Caution from the Dean and Chapter, by their Letters patent, that such a proceeding should not turn to the Prejudice of his Prerogative at any other Time. Accordingly we see here the Resignation of Albert, the Election of Reiner, his Journey to Rome, and Consecration there, and his Return to Armagh, all by the Month of June, 1247.'—Ware-Harris, i. p. 66.

² Theiner, 49; *Cal. Pap. Reg.*, i. p. 242.

Probably no vacancy existed at the moment in the province of Armagh, and it is possible that no desirable benefice fell vacant during the next few years. The archdiocese of Armagh, as we know from several sources, was poor in revenues, and its suffragan sees were probably in a similar plight. Primate Reginald would naturally feel disinclined to bestow one of the few fat benefices of his distressed province upon an absentee foreigner, even though he may have personally known Master Thedisius at the papal court. After some interval a second mandate was addressed to Reginald, commanding him to confer the church of St. Patrick, in the diocese of Clonmacnois, upon the worthy Master Thedisius; but this mandate failed like its predecessor, possibly because the Clonmacnois benefice was no longer vacant. On July 21, 1254—six years after his original effort, and only a few months before his death—Innocent IV returned once more to the charge on behalf of his protégé. At this time Primate Reginald was in Italy, and David MacCarroll, the new Archbishop of Cashel, had not yet been confirmed. Innocent IV, therefore, addressed his

Mandate to the treasurer of Cashel and Master John de Frusinone, papal chaplains, to proceed to make provision to Master Thedisius de Lavania, papal writer, of some benefice in the province of Armagh; a former mandate to the Archbishop of Armagh, by which provision was to have been made to Thedisius of the church of St. Patrick, in the diocese of Clonmacnois, assigned to the Abbot and convent of Granard, in the diocese of Ardagh, having been without effect.¹

This mandate seems to imply a mild censure on Primate Reginald, who was probably regarded by Innocent IV as lacking in a proper disposition to oblige, when there was question of providing comfortable Irish sinecures for foreign ecclesiastics. The Irish Church was so overrun with English intruders, many of them pluralists, who monopolised

¹ *Cal. Pap. Reg.*, i. p. 308. The *Calendar* gives 'Cloyne' in mistake for 'Clonmacnois,' as Dr. B. MacCarthy has pointed out (*I. E. RECORD*, April, 1895).

the best livings, that a Primate of Armagh might reasonably be excused for lack of zeal in opening the door to fresh inroads of foreign absentees.

Apart from these matters of administration Reginald had to devote his practical attention to certain questions of a more or less diplomatic nature. Secure, for the time being, in the favour of Henry III, the Primate deemed it advisable to intercede with that monarch on behalf of a Munster prelate, whose appointment had violated some of the feudal canons to which Henry was so jealously attached. About the month of December, 1249, Reginald wrote to the English King, praying the royal assent in favour of Gilbert, Bishop of Emly, who had been consecrated by the Pope: 'R[einer], Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland, to the King. Prays the royal assent in favour of Gilbert, Bishop of Emly, who had been consecrated by the Pope.'¹ About the same time the Bishop of Albano wrote to mollify the English monarch, stating that, by special command of the Pope, he had consecrated Gilbert for the see of Emly, and praying the King to place the new prelate in possession of the temporalities of his see.² Henry, to whom such acts of interference with his feudal claims were intensely abhorrent, vented his displeasure upon the new Bishop of Emly by sequestering his revenues for nearly two years longer. It was only on October 11, 1251, that Bishop Gilbert O'Doherty, who had formerly been Dean of Emly, received the temporal possessions of his see. Bishop O'Doherty must have sighed bitterly for the old days, only fourscore years past, when episcopal elections were carried out in peace and freedom, before Church revenues had become a prey to the rapacity of English kings. With the contemporary English singer, he must have felt that

This is the sum : the Pope of Rome
Yields too much to the King,³

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1171-2151*, p. 452.

² *Ibid.*, p. 452.

³ *The Misrule of Henry III*, p. 27.

and that the recognition by the Holy See of the preposterous feudal claims of English sovereigns was a grievous misfortune for the Irish Church. Bishop Gilbert was destined to outlive Primate Reginald; he ruled his diocese during sixteen years, and died on October 9, 1265.¹

The administration of justice in Ireland was far from satisfactory, as Primate Reginald speedily discovered, and as we know now from numerous other sources. At the Primate's request, Henry III allowed him to have 'justices to be assigned from month to month, if need be, by the Justiciary of Ireland, to hear and determine the complaints and pleas touching the Archbishop and his Church.' By a mandate issued from Windsor, on May 29, 1250, the King ordered the Justiciary 'to cause the Archbishop to have such justices.'² No vestige of these pleas and complaints has survived, so far as I can ascertain, among the documents of the Irish Record Office; and we shall presently see how, during the last four or five years of Reginald's life, legal proceedings against him were for the most part suspended.

Meanwhile, Reginald found a vista of fresh troubles opening before him. On June 16, 1250, Henry III wrote from Woodstock to the Archbishop of Armagh and other prelates, enclosing 'copies of Papal Letters, whereby many boons had been granted to the promoters of the Crusade on account of the King's having assumed the Cross. The King proposing to carry out his vow, prays the Archbishop to have the cause of the Crusade preached throughout all Ireland, and the Pope's Letters published, sending copies to some persons.'³

Willing as Reginald may have been to promote the success of the intended crusade, he must have felt that the slender resources of his archdiocese could ill bear the strain of fresh exactions. He probably felt also, with some of his contemporaries, that Henry's 'only reason for

¹ Cotton, *Fasti*, i. p. 87.

² *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1171-1251*, p. 455. This grant was renewed on June 14 following (*ibid.*, p. 457).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 457.

taking the cross was that it would give him an opportunity to extort money¹ from the nobles and clergy of England and Ireland. Much of the crusade-money might be diverted from its proper purpose; for the English monarch, always in straits for funds, would find some plausible pretext for appropriating, wholly or in part, the sums subscribed in aid of the crusading armies. That Reginald was eager, in these circumstances, to facilitate the preaching of the crusade seems more than doubtful; at all events, before three years were over, he had incurred the deep resentment of Henry III by his opposition to the extortionate demands of the royal crusader.

M. H. MACINERNEY, O.P.

[To be continued.]

¹ M. Paris, vol. v. p. 101; *Misrule of Henry III*, p. 134.

MENTAL HYGIENE

BY CHRISTOPHER REDDIN, B.A.

SOME time ago it was reported in the newspapers that the United States Government had issued, for the guidance of its people, a circular on mental hygiene. Apparently the annual statistics had been revealing the steady growth of such unpleasant national symptoms, that the authorities felt called upon to issue instructions, much after the fashion of a doctor prescribing for his patients. In effect, the people were counselled against overwork, fretting, despondency, and other kindred ailments; they were advised to think rightly, and indeed those who had troubles were invited to tell them to others, and not to be too miserly in keeping them under cover for their own special delectation. It is strange that this remarkable circular did not excite greater comment in the Press. That the Government of a country should so conceive its obligations as to tell its subjects in plain language not to worry and to avoid over-anxiety in matters mundane, must at least be considered an historical event. In these countries the Mental Deficiency Bill was, and is still, looked upon by many people as a measure fraught with many potential dangers, and one likely to lead in its administration to grave abuses. In Parliament and the Press, much criticism of this nature was heard at the time. Should the British Government, however, issue a document instructing the people to take life easy, and not to be in a great hurry to forfeit mental health for other less valuable *quid pro quos*, it is to be feared that many would cry halt, and draw attention in no uncertain manner to the limits of a Government's functions. The humorous journals would

certainly look forward to the issue of such a circular as a golden event, and one that should be made to produce a great harvest, from their point of view. On grounds of mental hygiene, Liberals and Conservatives would probably be advised to come together and unfold their mutual fears and anxieties. Parliamentary legislation would thus be got through with the maximum of agreement, and the minimum of time. The only danger, perhaps, would be that minorities would, in the circumstances supposed, so dwindle as to threaten the existence of party government by the gradual elimination of any opposition to the measures proposed.

Apart, however, from the humorous aspect thus depicted, the subject of mental hygiene is one that in point of fact calls, nowadays, for serious consideration. Healthy mental life, individually as well as nationally, is a thing possessing great intrinsic value; indeed history records strongly in its favour. The Romans were great and powerful as long as they led simple and healthy lives—as many of them did on their farms. From the time of Augustus Emperor, however, it is not difficult to perceive the germs of that mental decay which may be said to have reached its climax in the frivolities of Nero, and his successors. Eastern luxury and Grecian art took captive the mighty mind of Rome, and gradually reduced it to a condition of effeminacy. Juvenal's famous *mens sana in corpore sano*, which is so applicable in this connexion, probably had its origin in the great change which the satirist perceived was coming over the thoughts and habits of the Roman people. In the present article, however, attention must be given, not so much to nations as to individuals. Owing to the multifold interests of modern life, and the greater mental efforts exerted in the struggle for success, the necessity for paying heed to the laws of mental hygiene requires to be specially emphasized. The human cerebrum to-day is called upon to digest oftentimes the maximum of detail in the minimum of time, and the modern rush of life is naturally fraught with correlative

evils. The rushy person is a worry to himself, and a general nuisance to others. His mind anticipates to-morrow, before he realises the facts of to-day. It is related that a great man—great in the best sense of the word—when once questioned as regards the most outstanding feature or fact of his life, answered that the more he pondered the greater was his wonder, when he thought of all the things about which he need not, and never should have, worried. It would do no harm if this ‘great thought’ were gramophoned the world over to-day. Mental leisure receives scant consideration in modern education, with the result that the daily lives of many are passed in fretting, fearing, and worrying about to-morrow.

And yet the majority of these people are not to be blamed, seeing that ‘they don’t know anything better.’ ‘Of your philosophy,’ says Shakespeare, ‘you make no use if you give way to accidental evils.’ It is comforting to have such a popular authority as Shakespeare on one’s side in urging the claims of philosophy as a mental tonic. However, Shakespeare’s prescription had perhaps more reference to the philosophy, acquired by the man in the street than to scientific philosophy—which presumes an acquaintance with logic, metaphysics, ethics, and the various philosophic syntheses. A knowledge of mental and moral science is a modern necessity for all those whose education is above the average, including those who devote themselves to serious speaking and writing. For such, its connexion with mental hygiene becomes at once apparent. When the mind traverses the different arenas of thought, and begins to deduct and induct, hygienic conditions only can be assured if it knows its own limitations as well as its own powers. Mental science alone teaches this useful and necessary corrective. Education is now advancing at such a rapid rate as to give rise to the prophecy that the time is not far off when university professors will be found cleaning streets and painting houses. Well, without doing violence to this prediction, it may be said that these scavengers and house-painters should not suffer

in their respective trades, if they are so fortunate as to be scientific philosophers. Needless to say, it is not proposed here to advocate the study of mental science as part of the ordinary school curriculum. Expediency and common sense forbid this at present. For all those, however, who occupy public positions and who presume to influence others, by thought or word, an acquaintance with logic, ethics, and metaphysics becomes of paramount importance. The special sciences such as law, mathematics, and languages are doubtless of great educative value; but mental science transcends these. It is universal, whereas the others are particular. And yet it is not necessary to begin its study with a wet towel round one's head. There is no reason why the pilgrim's journey in the regions of speculative thought should not afford great pleasure and profit. It is as interesting and as amusing as one would wish. The more humorous and joyous one is by nature, the greater becomes the pleasure. Philosophers are very human after all. Oftentimes one of them starts well with first principles and a good theory of knowledge, and then he proceeds to bolster up some impossible synthesis—provoking one to laughter, if not forceful and uncomplimentary remarks. Then a second takes up the sinuous thread, points out the innumerable absurdities involved in the hypothesis of the other, and then begins to construct his synthesis. It is unnecessary to point out that 'he' does not solve the riddle of the universe either.

For instance, previous to the time of Socrates—who is said to have brought down philosophy from heaven to earth—there were two schools of thought that taught absolutely contradictory principles. The Eleatics taught that Being, considered as the highest concept, was 'one and unchangeable,' or as it is perhaps better known, the 'unity and totality of Being.' The Ionians taught, on the other hand, the doctrine of 'universal change,' and that Being was not one but 'Becoming.' Between these two extremes the ordinary mortal can please himself as much as he likes. Indeed the outstanding feature about philo-

sophy, from the earliest Babylonian times to the present day, is its variety and elasticity sufficient to suit all mental states. But then people may naturally cry *Cui bono?*—What's the use of it? Well, philosophy certainly teaches the 'littleness of knowledge' possessed by the great philosophers themselves in the matter of solving the problems of existence, etc. But then to know how little is known is, humanly speaking, a big thing, and certainly it is something quite distinct from not knowing this. That it is real knowledge to know how much—whether it be great or small—another person knows about any particular subject is an axiomatic truth requiring no demonstration. Lawyers, business men, politicians, no less than philosophers are quite alive to the importance of this kind of knowledge. It may, however, comfort the neophyte to know that, as regards philosophy, a little knowledge is not a dangerous thing. Too much philosophy, at least for the ordinary man, is bad, but as a little of it goes a long way, such a mistake should be easily avoided.

The three constituents already mentioned, viz., logic, metaphysics, and ethics, constitute the scientific philosopher's outfit. Logic strips the mind, as Bacon would say, of its idols of thought, and causes it to particularise and generalise correctly. Metaphysics probes it with a searching fire and discusses its relation with that contrary element—matter. Ethics confirms within it those primary ideas of duty and of obligation, and discovers its subserviency to that great Eternal Law, which binds the psychical no less than the physical world. It will be interesting to review these constituents at greater length, and in such a way as to enlist the sympathy of that modern Solomon, viz., the man in the street.

Many definitions have been given of Logic. All are more or less faulty. Mill puts it very concisely, thus: 'Logic is the science of the operations of the understanding which are subservient to the estimation of evidence.' Other definitions, though less comprehensive, are more terse, such as, 'the science of the laws of thought' and 'the

science and art of reasoning.' Is Logic an art or a science ? Well, it has been called the 'art of arts' and the 'science of sciences.' It is a science rather than an art in the sense, that it will not make one reason correctly. It merely furnishes rules whereby false reasoning may be detected. Logic is again the 'science of sciences,' inasmuch as no progress can be made in any of the special sciences without its aid. Logic alone furnishes rules whereby valid deductions can be made from the facts or data in the particular sciences. A knowledge of logic is a *sine qua non* in the case of all serious writers or speakers. Only the logician can detect false inferences and unsuspected incongruities in the arguments of others. The book work, otherwise known as formal logic, is especially interesting. Discussions on terms, definitions, categories, predicables, and the syllogism must necessarily prove very instructive. The syllogism, as a method of reasoning, is pretty generally accepted, and a knowledge of its use in practice thus becomes of great importance. Applied logic, or Induction, presents greater difficulties. The thought, as it exists in the subjective mind, is now brought into contrast with the thing, as it exists in the objective world. Those little words, 'cause and effect' are now elaborated. When does the cause end and the effect begin ? In this department of logic, especially, Mill, Whately, Whewell, Bradley and others disport themselves at will. As an epoch-making discovery Mills' inductive methods deserve much attention. Logic as an art is very happy in the fallacies which it exposes. Those 'make believes' abound everywhere, in platform, pulpit, and parliament. Fallacies are classified according as they exist in speech, or outside speech. Few people are aware how great is the swarm and how destructive are the ravages of these microbes which infest the common talk. The logician alone provides the remedy, and easily destroys their claim to validity.

Metaphysics is certainly not a subject to have recourse to if a person requires a light mental pabulum, and yet it is a study no one with a true spirit of learning can afford

to ignore. It is usually subdivided into General Metaphysics, Cosmology, Psychology, and Natural Theology. The first deals with the fundamental concept of all thought, viz., Being, together with its properties and accompaniments such as Essence, Existence, Potentiality, and Actuality. Cosmology inquires into the constituents of matter, and discusses such transcendent ideas as motion, space, and time. Psychology is perhaps the most interesting. It deals with that all-important person, the Ego, and analyses its constituents and operations. Sensations, perceptions, thoughts, volitions, and emotions; the five senses, including memory and imagination; the feelings, such as love, desire, joy, hate, aversion, and sadness—all these form subjects for deep and searching investigation. Herein that great principle, *operare sequitur esse*, unfolds itself; in other words, that the essence of a thing is known by the way it operates. It seems simplicity itself, but so is everything, when it is known. That 'vital spark of heavenly flame,' alias the soul, now comes under purview. Its functions are sentient and intellectual, and it is discovered to be a spiritual substance, still in itself simple and indivisible. An eminence has now been reached whence one may prospect in awe. How does the soul move the body, or the body the soul? If no reply is immediately forthcoming, it is because there are so many. Aristotle locates happiness in the speculative understanding contemplating, for contemplation's sake, the noblest objects. The psychical state of man, when he contemplates the enigma of his own existence, is pre-eminently a happy one; too happy, perhaps, had he not to descend from the realm of metaphysics, from time to time, to follow objects of a baser world.

What befits man's rational nature? What ought he to do? Why should he do these nature befitting things? Strictly speaking Ethics aims at discovering those human acts that accord with man's rational nature. What is known as Deontology aims at roofing, so to speak, this ethical structure, by disclosing a Moral Obliger. Without

this Moral Obliger mankind, in offending against conventional ethics, would commit nothing more than philosophic sin. That God must of necessity bind his creatures to certain lines of action is generally accepted among moralists. The Eternal Law, which controls the rational and irrational world, thus reveals itself. As regards the rational world, this majestic principle is better known as the 'Natural Law' which is promulgated and imposed by the conscience of each moral being. Such primary ideas as love of parents, the doing of right, and the avoidance of wrong are universal, as they are found to exist among all nations. Dissertations on happiness, pleasure, habits and the virtues form a very large portion of every treatise on ethics. Utilitarianism, Altruism, Socialism and other ethical constructions may be usefully studied for practical reasons. It may be interesting to note, *apropos* of ethics, that Kant, the great German philosopher, pre-eminently upholds the moral law, and makes it the foundation of all his ethical structures.

Finally, the history of philosophy claims attention, and the record of the many efforts made towards solving the mysteries of life must necessarily furnish interesting reading. The conclusions of the ordinary man are made from the data of practical life, and as he is very often a philosopher in his own way, he usually experiences great pleasure in unfolding them to others. Evolution may be his pet theme. Well, in the history of the philosophers, he has put before him all the conclusions arrived at by the world's greatest intellects from the earliest times. Man is continually endeavouring to rob nature of her secrets. All human knowledge must, of course, conform to human limits, for if the ordinary man by rational speculation could see things as they are, or satisfactorily define them, he would thereby transcend his own human nature. Philosophic history contains the syntheses of life of the professional thinkers. The whole mental field has been exhaustively ploughed in the period, say, from Socrates to Kant. Every school of thought—whether it be sensist,

mystic, or eclectic—is here well represented. Greece, peerless in culture, is certainly peerless in her philosophy. The irony of Socrates, the aerial flights of Plato, and the deep profundity of Aristotle, represent in many respects the whole basis of all subsequent philosophy. The syntheses of St. Thomas Aquinas, the developments and speculations of Spinoza, Locke, Hume, and Kant, are built in and about the crevices of the Greek structure. It is a Pantheon, with many side-chapels. The ordinary man may now well ask what is the result of all these attempts made towards solving the riddle of the universe. The true philosopher would readily answer, ‘Nothing and yet everything.’ For now he knows his own ignorance, his own relative nothingness, and the omnipotence of his Maker. To sum up, it may be said that man stands now where he has always stood, groping his way in an intellectual maze; ever attempting what is above and beyond his limited nature, and thereby continually getting lost in the recesses of his own thought; never slacking in his puny efforts, trying to solve the vast mysterious scheme of that Eternal Intelligence, which governs this planet, the whole planetary system, and all that is extramental, yet subjected to, the one infinite Ego.

It is hoped, as a result of this short outline of the fundamentals of philosophic science, that the reader will be induced to give it the attention it deserves—in the first place, on educational grounds, and, secondly, with a view to promoting hygienic conditions of mind. Educationally the subject is of transcendent value. The logical mind is easily first; the rest nowhere. The number of aspects from which any given subject can be viewed may be said to be proportional to one’s width of thought, or range of ideas. In this respect the metaphysician, for example, possesses a great advantage over his less educated opponent. Although it has been stated that a little philosophy goes a long way, it is necessary to reiterate that this little must be fully grasped, and the student should endeavour to bring this knowledge into play in practical questions.

Then, on hygienic grounds the value of mental science is equally great. It brings order and comfort, where chaos and anxiety previously reigned. 'Philosophic calm' is proverbial, and connotes a state of mind worth striving for. It can only with truth be applied to the scientific philosopher, because his knowledge possesses a pleasing self-sufficiency, and extends as far as human limits will permit. Mental science is the outfit, whereby the mind can assimilate ideas in the correct way, and without suffering any loss, or becoming in any way impaired. In philosophy, one touches upon questions that go to the root of the problems of life, and in studying such transcendent ideas as time, space, and motion, confusion, trepidation, worry, and other human ills easily become exterminated. To misquote Shakespeare, it may be said that 'there are no things in heaven or earth that are not dreamt of in scientific philosophy.' In civilisation and culture the scientific philosopher represents the 'class' mind, for he alone can appreciate things, in themselves, and according to their relativity, as far as human capabilities will allow.

C. REDDIN.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

REPETITION OF EXTREME UNCTION

REV. DEAR SIR,—In consequence of some articles that appeared in a certain ecclesiastical journal *re* the repetition of Extreme Unction, I send you the following practical question for solution in the I. E. RECORD :—

Caius, who was suffering from some malignant internal growth according to medical testimony, was anointed on September 13; his removal to a city hospital was suggested by some friends to undergo an operation; consequently on Sunday, September 20, he was helped to dress, and he sat up for some part of that day only. During that same week another doctor was called in, and he said the patient was far too weak to be removed, that he might die on the way. During that same week Sacerdos B. calls in, and he again anoints the patient, although, as I have said, he was anointed by Sacerdos A. on September 13. The patient dies on October 7, just three weeks and three days after being first anointed by Sacerdos A.

Here you have medical testimony and dates sufficient to exemplify case. What as regards Sacerdos B.?

As regards the danger of the profanation of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, would you suggest some rule to guide missionary priests. I fear that even Dr. Kane's monthly anointing is fraught with danger, and to be used with great caution. A word of enlightenment would oblige.

W.

The rule about monthly anointing represents, of course, merely an approximation. There is no law, human or divine, fixing a month as the specified time.

The real principle is that a patient may be re-anointed when one serious danger of death from illness has passed and another supervened. That may occur in an hour or less; it may *not* occur in a month; evidence in each individual case must decide the issue. But suppose that, in a particular instance, there is no special evidence one way or the other. The patient, we may take it, is suffering from a lingering illness that will certainly cause his death sooner or later; there are partial recoveries and partial relapses: he has lived longer than was hoped or anticipated. When may we, always in the absence of special evidence, take it for granted, as a general

rule and in normal cases, that a recovery and a relapse have taken place? The matter, we are sure, will never be determined mathematically. But common sense fixes on a period of a month or so as a reasonable standard. It is only a standard—a rough rule in practical life—an approximation that will give us good results as a whole, but will always yield to evidence, one way or the other, to the contrary.

The month's standard has, we are aware, been defended on a different principle. It is maintained¹ that, in such cases, there is no question of the 'repetition' of Extreme Unction. The fact that a patient has survived for a month proves, it is contended, that he was originally in no 'danger of death'; that the conditions for valid administration were absent, and that the Sacrament is now being administered for the first time. The suggestion is ingenious, and much may be said in its favour. But, from the point of view of Moral Theology, all we are concerned with is the fact that, in both theories, the practical consequences are quite the same.

One other point. For several centuries the Church was very lenient in regard to the conditions required for the administration of Extreme Unction—practices, in fact, were tolerated that even the most liberal of modern theologians would hesitate to sanction.² We cannot, of course, appeal to these practices as furnishing a permanent standard, but we can quote them as supporting the underlying principle of the teaching now generally admitted:

1°. That the Sacrament may be administered when it is *probable* that the invalid is in serious, though not imminent, danger of death from illness;

2°. That it may be re-administered when it is *probable* that the patient has recovered and relapsed.

On the general principles given we may, therefore, say:

1°. That, apart from special evidence, a priest may conclude that, after a month or so, the first danger of death has passed;

2°. That, if the patient is now probably in danger, the Sacrament may be re-administered, but

3°. That these are merely presumptions. They disappear when evidence to the contrary is forthcoming.

On the same general principles we are rather inclined to disagree with 'Sacerdos B.' There may have been facts that influenced him, and that are not fully recorded: we can only take it, though, that the case has been fully stated. The patient was anointed on September 13. On general principles a re-anointment

¹ See the *Irish Theological Quarterly*, January, 1907, p. 54.

² *Ibid.*, April, 1907, pp. 247 sqq.

should be postponed for a month. The general principles should yield to evidence. But was there any evidence? None, except that the patient got up for a little while on September 20. He might have done so any day, we are sure, during his illness, and the fact would furnish no proof of recovery. Yet in face of the general presumption, and without special proof of recovery, he was re-anointed. We think the time allowed was insufficient.

CONFESSIONS OF NUNS AND SISTERS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I shall be very thankful if you reply through the pages of the I. E. RECORD to the following: Does the Decree of the S. Cong. de Religiosis, *In Audientia* (August 5, 1913), apply to Orders and Congregations of women? In other words, are Nuns and Sisters on the same footing as the laity in regard to confession?

EXSUL.

For reasons already suggested or discussed¹—the chief being that a special decree regarding Orders and Congregations of women had recently been issued, and that a document of that kind is not usually set aside without express mention—we believe that the *In Audientia* applies to men only.

We are confirmed in our belief by documents that several members of religious Orders have kindly sent us in connexion with previous replies. We have acknowledged them privately, and we have pleasure now in repeating the acknowledgment. But we have no permission to publish them, and can only assure 'Exsul' that, on the point he raises, they appear quite decisive.

ADMISSION OF NON-CATHOLICS AS SPONSORS

REV. DEAR SIR,—At a baptism recently two partners in a mixed marriage, the husband a Protestant, the wife a Catholic, appeared as sponsors for a neighbour's child—the offspring of a mixed marriage also. The husband has, all through his married life, carried out very conscientiously the promises asked for and freely given at the time of his marriage. All the children are Catholics: they have been all educated at Catholic schools, and one of them, last year, became a nun, with her father's consent and, in fact, positive approval. Some friends of his assure me that it is more than likely he will become a Catholic himself in the near future. The parish priest, though, would not allow him to act as sponsor. The refusal has given great offence to both families, is likely, indeed, to affect the man's good intentions and to lead to very unpleasant consequences. The parents of the child have stated that, if similar circumstances arose again, they would have the ceremony performed by a Protestant minister. The Church law, I know, is strict,

¹ See I. E. RECORD, May and June issues, 1914 (Fifth Series, vol. iii.).

but I wonder is it so strict as not to admit of exception—in cases, say, like the one I mention. As it is not at all impossible that I shall be confronted soon with a similar problem myself, I should very much like to have your opinion.

VICARIUS.

The Church law is certainly strict. And while we think it probable enough that, in the circumstances hinted at in the parents' statement, the admission of a non-Catholic might be tolerated, we must grant that the positive decisions on the point give us very little support.

We will just quote a few of them, and then see if there are any grounds for making an exception in extreme cases.

An instruction issued in the year 1763¹ contains the following paragraph :—

The other (a non-Catholic) will be present as witness, not as sponsor; . . . and, if he nevertheless intrudes himself and wishes expressly to fulfil the function of sponsor, the priest ought to abstain from administering the Sacrament; and not to be troubled because a profanation of the Sacrament may result inasmuch as a schismatic priest or a Protestant may confer it. For the Catholic minister does not co-operate in the matter: and the profanation and co-operation in another's sin is not avoided by the admission of an heretical sponsor.

Another instruction of the Holy Office² is more general in its terms :—

It is unlawful in sacred functions to invite heretics into choir, chant with them, give them the *pax*, ashes, candles, blessed palms, and other similar things connected with external worship, inasmuch as these are rightly regarded as indications of an internal bond and consent.

A decree of 1900³ is in the same sense. An Archbishop who inquired whether 'he might allow a Protestant to act as sponsor in the Catholic baptism of the daughter of parents united in mixed marriage by an heretical minister' was informed 'permitti non posse.'

The Ritual is equally emphatic⁴:—

Parish priests are to know that admission to this function (sponsorship) is not to be granted to infidels, or heretics, or persons publicly excommunicated or interdicted, or public criminals, or infamous people or to the insane, or those ignorant of the rudiments of faith. For sponsors, when the need arises, are bound to teach these matters to the spiritual children they have taken from the baptismal font.

¹ Vide *Collect. S. C. de Prop. Fide*, n. 606.

² Ibid. n. 1843 (June 8, 1859).

³ June 27. Vide *Acta S. Sedis*, xxxiii. 372.

⁴ Tit. ii. n. 25.

In connexion with all this, though, we may note :

1°. That the decrees were replies to special queries, and do not constitute a universal law.

2°. That the circumstances were, in some cases, peculiar : in the case submitted, for instance, by the Archbishop. And circumstances, especially public feeling and opinion, often decide whether an act is co-operation with heresy or not.

3°. That the general statement of the Ritual has been modified by a declaration of the Penitentiary¹ to the extent of allowing the Bishop to use his discretion in favour of tolerated excommunicates, when greater evils are likely to arise from their non-admission.

4°. That though this modification does not extend to heretics—as a later decree shows—we have strict evidence only for the case in which baptism can be conferred without any sponsor. The decree runs :—

In a certain parish of Hungary it happened that a mother apostatised from the Catholic faith because the parish priest, in baptising her child, rejected, in harmony with the Church's laws, an heretical sponsor. Since, according to the declaration of the Penitentiary (December 10, 1860) a person notoriously censured may be admitted to the position of sponsor, if greater evils seem likely to follow from his rejection, the question is put whether this declaration may be extended to heretical sponsors, or whether it is better, as some think, in difficult cases of the kind, to administer baptism without a sponsor. The Holy Office (May 3, 1893) replied, 'No ; it is better to have baptism conferred without a sponsor, if matters cannot be arranged otherwise.'

5°. That the reason given by the Holy Office, namely, that the admission of a heretic to Catholic functions involves 'communion (with him) in divine things' does not always apply. Otherwise a mixed marriage, for instance, would never be lawful. It will sometimes happen that a non-Catholic sponsor merely intends, and is understood to intend, participating in the civil honour. Even apart from that, all that his action need necessarily imply is that, on this point at all events, he considers Catholic practice correct. And the difficulty about handing over a Catholic child to the spiritual care of a non-Catholic sponsor is obviated by the fact that, in many cases, the latter really never thinks of assuming such responsibility ; and that sometimes, as in the case before us, his record gives us certainty that, in the event of his services being called upon, he will discharge his duty conscientiously and give this child, as he has given his own, a good Catholic education.

6°. That, for all these reasons, it is not at all clear that the prohibitive law, though general, is universal.

¹ December 10, 1860.

In practice, of course, the priest will make every effort to have another sponsor, and take the non-Catholic merely as a witness. If that be objected to, he will try to confer the baptism without any sponsor; and the ignorance on the part of the non-Catholic regarding the essentials for assuming the responsibility will generally enable him to succeed. But, if all that fails, and there remains merely the alternative of having the child baptised either by a Protestant minister or with a Protestant sponsor of the character described by 'Vicarius,' we think there are good grounds for saying that the second course is one that might, in the exceptional circumstances, be tolerated.

CASE OF RESTITUTION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Please answer in next issue of the I. E. RECORD the following case of restitution.

A penitent gives £1 to a confessor—money she borrowed 35 years ago from a parish priest long since dead. To whom is the money to be restored? If to the heirs, to which of them? There is no brother or sister alive, but there is a great number of nephews and nieces, grand-nephews and grand-nieces, etc.

ANXIOUS.

The money goes to the heirs, but the trouble is to find out who they are.

If the deceased left his property to one, or to several in proportion, the money is payable to him or his representatives, or to them or their representatives in similar proportion. If he left definite sums to several and appointed a residuary legatee, restitution is to be made to the latter, or, again, to his representatives in proportion. If he made no will and so gave many relatives a right, the conscience money is to be divided among them in the proportion guaranteed by civil law. Other hypotheses may be made, but, in view of the trifling sum at stake, we may take these as sufficient.

In some at least of the hypotheses mentioned, the amount payable to each would be so small that there would be no grave obligation in regard to any individual, and the difficulty of fixing the true proportion would be sufficiently serious to excuse from attempts at mathematical accuracy. It might be given to the more obvious deserving claimants. Indeed, if the number of nephews and nieces, etc., has multiplied to the extent that 'Anxious' would seem to suggest, and the amount due to each become in consequence ridiculously small, he may consider the possibility of having the heirs' presumed consent to having the money devoted to some charitable purpose for the repose of the soul of the deceased.

INVALIDITY OF MARRIAGE

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be grateful for your opinion on the following, which is a case similar in principle to the one you discuss on page 239 of the March (1915) number of the I. E. RECORD.

Let us suppose that immediately after the parish priest of parish A has finished the ceremony, the parties adjourn to the sacristy to sign the register. The parties to be married are invited by the curate of parish B to sign the register, and the curate superintends the signing to see that it be properly done. The register is signed by the contracting parties in the presence of the same two witnesses who were present at the parish priest's ceremony, and these two witnesses are quite aware of what the contracting parties are doing when signing.

Can it be safely held that this signing is a renewal of consent expressed in writing, not in words: that as the curate invites them to sign he is asking for their consent; that as he sees that the signing is properly done he is receiving the consent as really as when one sees that it is properly expressed in words; and consequently, since the curate is properly delegated, the marriage validly takes place in the sacristy?

I presume that the curate has been invited to the marriage, or if not that he is implicitly invited when the parties present themselves to him to sign the register under his care.

X. Y. Z.

If the curate and other parties principally concerned intended the signing of the register as a renewal of matrimonial consent, and if the conditions of the *Ne Temere* were in other respects observed, the marriage would be valid. But everything seems to show that the opposite was the case. The parties, we are sure, did not regard the signing as a renewal—they did not even know that a renewal was necessary; they did not invite the curate to assist in his official capacity, nor, we think, did he intend so acting. All the circumstances appear to point to the conclusion that there was no real renewal, only a continuance of the assent already given—which consent, though naturally valid, was invalidated by the law of clandestinity.

Renewal may, of course, be expressed in acts as well as in words. But, in either case, the parties should be aware of the previous invalidity and intend a consent independent of the first. A parallel instance is afforded by the continued 'matrimonial' relations of persons, whose marriage is invalid by the law of clandestinity, but who live now in a place where the law of clandestinity does not bind. On that matter we may recall a passage that 'X. Y. Z.' is, of course, acquainted with:—

Si vero illi, qui propter solum defectum formae legitimi conjuges non sunt, nunc versantur in loco, ubi eorum matrimonii valor a forma ecclesiastica exemptus est, fiunt veri conjuges, si sui matrimonii nullitatem cognoscentes vitam conjugalem libere protrahunt animo conjugali. Eo ipso enim ponunt non verbis, sed factis consensum conjugalem in eo

loco ubi consensus privatus matrimonium validum efficit. . . Verum si nescientes sui matrimonii nullitatem in conubio perseverant, nihil efficiunt, idque ne tum quidem, quando ita comparati sunt, ut si nullitatem scivissent, eam emendassent : perseverant nimirum in priore consensu invalido, quem emendassent quidem sed revera non emendarunt. Aliis verbis : debent consensum a priore consensu independentem ponere, quo illius defectus emendetur. Hoc ita certum est, ut S. Congr. matrimonia illis conditionibus producta non dubitet pronuntiare nulla, data potestate ad alias nuptias transeundi.¹

A *sanatio in radice* is possible, but it is very seldom given when the law of clandestinity has not been complied with.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

NECESSITY OF CANONICAL ADMONITIONS BEFORE THE INFLECTION OF REPRESSIVE PUNISHMENT

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you be good enough to let me know whether the canonical admonitions required by the general Canon Law before the infliction of censures are necessary also before the infliction of other forms of punishments? I have been recently reading Smith's Commentary on the decree *Cum Magnopere*, and there I find it laid down that the preventive remedies, amongst which are canonical admonitions, should be always adopted before having recourse to any form of repressive punishment. Smith even maintains that should a Bishop act otherwise, and proceed at once to the infliction of repressive punishment, he would act invalidly.

Would you kindly let me know what you think of this teaching?

INQUIRER.

In order to make this query and our reply fully intelligible to the general reader, it is necessary to make a few prefatory remarks.

The Instruction *Cum Magnopere* is the American form of the Instruction *Sacra Haec*, issued by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars in 1880, and differs from it only in a few unimportant details.

The object of both is to introduce a summary method of inflicting punishment in the criminal causes of clerics. Whatever may be said about the original extension of those two decrees, nowadays it is certain that the procedure which they outline may be followed universally. Two classes of punishments are dealt with—preventive and repressive punishments. The preventive remedies mentioned in the Instructions are spiritual retreats,

¹ Lehmkuhl, *Th. Mor.*, ii. (n. 1051).

canonical admonitions, and precepts; though this enumeration is not exhaustive, nor is it intended to be so. They are merely paternal punishments not exceeding the paternal power of a Bishop, and may be imposed without any judicial process after merely informal verification of the facts on account of which their imposition has been deemed necessary. The repressive remedies, on the other hand, are punishments in the strict sense of the term, including both censures and vindicative punishments, and require the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction for their infliction. When an ecclesiastical superior directly imposes them he can do so only as the result of a judicial process, with the one exception of suspension *ex informata conscientia*, which, although a repressive punishment, may be extra-judicially inflicted.

The question raised by our correspondent is whether the preventive remedies and, in particular, canonical admonitions, should be always previously employed before proceeding to the infliction of the repressive remedies. Smith, in his Commentary on the Instruction *Cum Magnopere*, answers this question in the affirmative. It will be of interest to quote the passage in which his views on this point are contained:—

According to Article 2 of this latter Instruction, and consequently also of the Instruction for the United States, all repressive punishments whatever—that is, not merely those which are usually called medicinal, but also those which are named punitive—appear to be primarily medicinal, and only secondarily vindicatory. Thus Article 2 of the Instruction say: ‘*Haec vero (remedia repressiva) eum in finem constituta sunt ut delinquentes ad bonam frugem revocentur.*’ If this be true, that is, if all repressive punishments are primarily medicinal, it follows that not only those repressive punishments which are called medicinal, but also those which were formerly termed vindicatory, must be preceded not only by the trial, but also by the canonical warnings and the precept; that, therefore, excepting in the case of punishments which are *a jure* and *latae sententiae*, the Ordinary cannot begin judicial proceedings until he has first given the warnings and the precept.

Smith’s teaching, then, is that since the publication of these Instructions, all punishments have become primarily medicinal, and, consequently, just as in the case of censures previously, they require to be preceded by canonical admonitions and precept, which takes the place of an admonition.

The foundation, then, of his theory is the change in the nature of punishment which he seems to think has been introduced by these decrees.

On this point the first remark which we should like to make is that the introduction of a change in the nature of punishment is altogether foreign to the purpose of the Instructions, which profess to deal only

with the method in which punishments may be inflicted. Consequently, even though an incidental clause might give some colour to the view that such a change had been brought about, we should be very slow in giving this conclusion our assent. But does the article referred to by Smith indicate that a modification regarding object of punishment has taken place? Well, as quoted by Smith, it certainly does; unfortunately, however, he has not given the clause in its entirety. The whole clause is as follows: 'Haec vero eum in finem constituta sunt ut delinquentes in bonam frugem revocentur, ac culparum consecraria e media tollantur.'

The corresponding section in the Instruction *Sacra Haec* is somewhat similar: 'Alia finem habent revocandi delinquentes ut sapiant, reparentque admissi criminis consequentias.' In these passages it is clearly indicated that the repressive punishments, besides the reform of the offender, have also the object of repairing the evil consequences which result from the commission of crime, and it is not stated which of these objects is the primary one. Accordingly these texts afford no justification whatsoever for concluding that the former is the primary object, in fact it seems clear that they leave the whole question untouched. In the theory of punishment, which has existed in the Church for centuries, the reform of the offender constitutes the primary object of censures or medicinal punishment, whereas the removal of the evil effects resulting from crime forms the main purpose of vindicative punishments. The texts referred to are clearly insufficient to justify a departure from this theory.

Smith's assumption, then, that a change has taken place in the nature of punishment is quite unwarranted, and consequently the conclusion based on this assumption, that nowadays canonical admonitions and precept should in all cases precede the infliction of repressive punishments, is without foundation. Hence the old discipline on this matter, which required the employment of admonitions before censures but not before vindicative punishments, is still the prevailing one.

As a matter of fact Smith is the only one of the commentators on the Instructions *Sacra Haec* and *Cum Magnopere*, whom we can find to advocate the necessity of employing in all cases the preventive remedies before having recourse to the repressive. Thus, for instance, Cardinal Gennari clearly lays down that the admonitions are necessary only before the imposition of censures¹; and in another place, speaking indiscriminately of the preventive and repressive remedies, he says that their application is left altogether

¹ *Sulla Privazione del Beneficio Eccl.*, p. 121.

to the prudence of the Bishop himself.¹ Lega, too, whilst admitting generally the utility of first utilising the preventive before having recourse to the repressive remedies, denies the necessity of universally following this course of action ; in fact, he asserts that this procedure would, in certain circumstances, be quite unreasonable.²

Absolute necessity is one thing, and charity and prudence are quite another. Very often, in circumstances in which a Bishop might immediately set on foot a judicial process for the infliction of repressive punishments, prudence and charity will dictate that the milder remedies should be first employed, and that only upon their failure should the more severe measures be taken. The application of the preventive punishments causes comparatively little inconvenience not only to the offender but also to the Bishop himself ; and hence the reasonable thing is that a trial should be given them, if there is any probability that the object in view will be thereby attained.

RESIDENCE OF PARISH PRIESTS

REV. DEAR SIR,—A certain parish priest would find it very convenient to reside, for some time, outside the limits of his own parish, as the parochial house is at present uninhabitable and will be so for a considerable period. His residence outside his parish would not interfere very materially with the performance of his duties, though, naturally enough, it would impose a certain amount of inconvenience upon his parishioners.

Would you kindly let me know if Canon Law would in these circumstances permit his residence outside his parish ?

PAROCHUS.

The Council of Trent, Sess. 23, c. 1, *de Ref.*, obliges pastors of souls, whether Bishops or parish priests, under the most severe penalties, to personal residence amongst the flock committed to their care.

Cardinal de Luca, commenting on this text, adduces many decisions of the Congregation of the Council to show that this obligation implied for parish priests residence in a house situated close to his own church—‘in domo prope ecclesiam pro habitatione parochi destinata.’³ Yet even from the very earliest times this regulation was not regarded as absolutely universal ; canonists very generally admitted that for a sufficient reason parish priests might

¹ ‘Qui però giustamente la Instruzione rimetto alla discrezione del Vescovo l'applicare i detti remedii, secondo la gravità dei casi e delle circostanze.’—*l.c.*, p. 111.

² ‘Equidem mediis praeservativis aliquando non est locus, ut ecce in parochum qui jampridem scandalose vivit vel qui ob recens facinus omnium odium et offensionem in se provocavit.’

³ Annot. in S. C. Trid., disc. 4, n. 11.

be permitted to reside a short distance outside the limits of their own parish. Thus Ferraris, in his *Bibliotheca*, writes on this point in the following terms: 'Parochus parochiali domo relicta poterit in paterna vel cognatorum domo intra fines parociae habitare, si ex ea poterit residentiae muneri satisfacere . . . et alii plures id sustinent etiamsi talis domus sit extra fines parociae dummodo non distet ultra miliare Italicum.'¹

Fagnanus quotes a decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, given on June 6, 1607, in which this view is confirmed:—

Sacra Congregatio censuit secundum ea quae proponuntur, Episcopum suo arbitrio posse permittere, ut rector, qui neque ex fructibus aedes in parochiali construere, nec alias intra suae parochiae fines conducere potest, inhabitet domum in altera parochia viciniore.

Atque ita in sua parochiali animarum curam gerat fructusque suos faciat, perinde ac si in parochiali habitaret, idque donec alia ratio, qua residentiae adamussim satisfiat, possit iniri.²

The same canonist quotes another decision to the effect that a parish priest, who presided over two united parishes, and who, with the permission of the Bishop, resided outside the boundaries of both, in order that thus he might more easily fulfil his parochial duties, was not guilty of any violation of the law of residence. The modern teaching is the same. It is agreed that a parish priest may, temporarily at least, reside outside his parish, provided his place of residence is so convenient that he can easily fulfil his parochial duties, and provided also the consent of his Bishop has been obtained.³

From what has been said, then, it is quite clear that Canon Law will permit the parish priest in the circumstances described to reside outside his parish, provided he obtains the consent of his Bishop to this arrangement.

POWER OF BISHOPS TO DISPENSE FROM THE STATUTES OF PROVINCIAL SYNODS

REV. DEAR SIR,—The question of how far individual Bishops can dispense from the statutes of their Provincial Councils recently came up for discussion amongst a few priests of my acquaintance. Some went so far as to maintain that these statutes, as they had to receive Papal approval, were withdrawn altogether from episcopal jurisdiction; whilst others, on the contrary, asserted that each Bishop possessed the same

¹ Ad verbum Parochus, art. ii. n. 17.

² Fagnanus, in caput Extirpandae, tit. De Praebendis, n. 18.

³ 'Etiam ut extra parochiae limites habitet parochus permitti potest, justa de causa, in loco tamen vicino ut officium suum convenienter expleri potest.'—Bouix, *De Parocho*, p. 561.

'Dende si raccoglie che il parroco non puo dimorare; neanche la notte, fuori i limiti della propria parrocchia, se la sua abitazione trovisi oltre un miglio dalla chiesa parrocchiale.'—Gennari, *Quistioni Canoniche*, p. 651.

power over them as over the statutes of his own Diocesan Synod. I should like to know :

1. Do the Acts of a Provincial Council always require the approval of the Holy See ?

2. What is the precise extent of an individual Bishop's power in this matter ?

As these questions are of some practical importance for me, I should be thankful for an immediate reply.

T. J. K.

There is absolutely no doubt that the acts of Provincial Councils must be always approved by the Holy See. The necessity of this approval is clearly set forth in the Constitution *Immensae* of Sixtus V : ' Provinciales Synodus, ubivis terrarum illae celebrentur, decreta ad se mitti praecipiet, eaque singula expendet et recognoscet.'

Cardinal Petra, in his Commentary on the Constitution *Charissimus* of Honorius II, says that according to the unanimous opinion of canonists of his time Papal approval was always required for Provincial Synods. His words are : ' Omnes docent ut transmittantur statuta haec conciliaria Papae, qui solet ea approbare, medio oraculo S. C. Concilii, nec possunt imprimi aut executioni demandari sine dicta facultate.' The teaching is quite as unanimous at the present time, so that we need not discuss the question further.

The approbation of the Holy See does not, however, change the nature of the statutes thus approved ; they do not thereby become Papal laws, nor acquire the properties of decrees, which emanate, in the first instance, from the Holy See, or which the Holy Father by his adoption makes his own, although they have directly proceeded from another source. In the technical language of the canonists the approval is only in *forma communi*, not in *forma specifica* ; in other words, it is practically only a revision, adding no jurisdictional authority to the law, to which it is given. Cardinal Petra, in the work to which we have referred, explains very clearly the nature of this approval :—

Sed an haec quae solet fieri a S. Concilio dicatur et sit pura revisio, vel confirmatio approbativa per modum legis ? Dicendum non esse talem actum inductivum juris majoris, nam ipsa verba Constitutionis Sixti V puram revisionem demandant ; cum potius sit actus quidam reverentialis erga primam Sedem et universalem Ecclesiae Pastorem debitus ab Episcopis, ut ante publicationem certior ille reddatur, et ut facilius decreta vim et robur recipiant saltem extensive, ut ita a subditis alacrius recipiantur.¹

The approbation of the Holy See, then, leaves the nature of the statutes of a Provincial Council altogether untouched, and consequently it need not be taken into consideration in determining the dispensing power of individual Bishops ; this matter must be settled on entirely independent principles.

¹ Comm. ad Const. Honorii II, *Charissimus*, vol. i. sed. i. n. 124.

For an adequate solution of this question we must distinguish between statutes, the dispensation from which is expressly reserved to the Council itself, and those in which there is no mention whatsoever of reservation. Well, of course, whenever the dispensation of statutes is reserved to the Synod itself, it is quite clear that individual Bishops are powerless. When a superior reserves certain matters to himself, power in these matters is certainly withdrawn from his inferiors, and of course a Provincial Synod is superior to the individual members of which it is composed.

But even when there is no special mention of reservation individual Bishops cannot, of their own proper authority, dispense, seeing that these laws are not their own, but those of a superior power; any jurisdiction which they may possess is purely the result of delegation. Canonists, however, are agreed that for their own subjects, whenever a reasonable cause exists, delegation from the Synod may always be presumed; and they base this presumption upon usage and upon the serious inconvenience to which individuals would otherwise be subjected.

Bonacina expresses very accurately the teaching of the leading authorities on this matter:—

Quando vero dispensatio non est reservata, sicut ordinario non solet reservari, praesumitur data facultas episcopo dispensandi pro sua dicecesi. Unicuique autem episcopo datam esse pro sua dicecesi facultatem colligitur tum ex usu, tum quia alioquin magnum onus, et incommodum subditis et ipsis Episcopis imponeretur, si pro singulis dispensationibus obtinendis adeundus esset Summus Pontifex, vel expectandum esset aliud Concilium.¹

Similar views are put forward by Suarez,² Sanchez,³ and Leurenus,⁴ to mention but a few of the more important of the older canonists; and the same teaching is advanced by modern writers on Canon Law who discuss this matter.⁵

From what has been said, however, it is quite clear that the power of a Bishop, even over these non-reserved statutes, is entirely different from his power over the statutes of his own Diocesan Synod. From these latter he can dispense, by his own proper authority, and consequently validly, even when no legitimate cause for dispensation exists; whereas from the former his power to dispense is only delegated, and as a result can be validly employed only when a reasonable cause is present.

J. KINANE.

¹ *De Leg.*, disp. i. q. ii. Punct. i. n. 14.

² *De Leg.*, l. vi. c. 15, n. 7.

³ *De Matr.*, l. vii. disp. 17, n. 35.

⁴ *For. Eccl.*, l. i. tit. 2, q. 185.

⁵ Vide Gennari, *Quistioni Canoniche*, p. 399; Ojetti, *Synopsis Rerum Moralium*, vol. i. p. 1097.

LITURGY

WHO MAY SING THE 'PANEM DE COELO' AT BENEDICTION? REVERENCES TO BE MADE BY A PRIEST BEFORE THE ALTAR OF EXPOSITION OR A SIDE ALTAR WHERE MASS IS BEING CELEBRATED. COMMUNION IN A MASS 'CORAM SANCTISSIMO,' AND BEFORE A REQUIEM MASS DURING PASCHAL TERM. THE 'KYRIE' IN CERTAIN MASSES. LESSONS FOR THE OCTAVE OF THE SOLEMNITY OF ST. JOSEPH

REV. DEAR SIR,—1. Is it correct for the Deacon or assisting Priest at Benediction to chant the *Panem de coelo*, etc.?

2. Should a priest when passing the altar of Exposition, in order to go to another altar to say Mass, remain uncovered all the time or only while actually adoring?

3. Should a priest, when going vested to or from the altar, genuflect when passing a side altar or altars at which the celebrating priest has passed the Consecration and has not yet communicated?

4. When giving Communion in a Mass celebrated *coram Sanctissimo* should the priest stand at the centre of the altar for the *Ecce Agnus Dei*, or a little to one side?

5. When giving Communion immediately before a Requiem Mass, during Paschal time, what prayers should be said?

6. In the Masses of certain *feriae*, when the *Kyrie* and *Dominus vobiscum* are separated, should the *Kyrie* be said at the Missal or at the centre of the altar?

7. In the new Psalter there is a supplement with special lessons for the octave of the Solemnity of St. Joseph, arranged for *Feria 2* to *Sabbato* inclusive. Now that the feast is kept on Wednesday, should the lessons be said on the second to seventh days in order, or are those marked for *Feria 2* to be said on Monday, and those marked for *Feria 5* on Thursday or the second day of the octave?

If you can find time and space for the solution of these difficulties the writer will be most grateful.

INQUIRING PRIEST.

1. According to the Ritual¹ and the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*² two 'clerics' or 'chanters' should sing the *Panem de coelo*. And this is the general teaching of writers on liturgy. The priest himself who is giving Benediction or any of his assistants is not supposed to sing the versicle. But the matter is not one of very grave importance.

2. We will suppose that the priest, as is usual, carries the chalice. The general rule is that a priest when carrying the chalice never uncovers except when he has to genuflect on both knees. When the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, the priest, as soon as he comes

¹ Tit. ix. c. 5, n. 5.

² Lib. ii. c. 35.

before the altar of Exposition (a) genuflects on both knees; (b) takes off his biretta; (c) makes a profound inclination of the head; (d) puts on his biretta, rises and proceeds on his way. It should be borne in mind that in this and similar cases the priest should not take off his biretta until *after* he has genuflected, and that he should put it on *before* he rises. If Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is actually being given the priest should remain kneeling and inclined until the monstrance has been placed on the altar. He then puts on his biretta, rises, and proceeds as before.¹

3. Between the Elevation and the Communion of the celebrant no genuflection is to be made by a priest who is passing a side altar on his way to or from the altar at which he is about to celebrate or has celebrated Mass. That is, as a general rule. This point was decided by the Congregation of Rites in the year 1904²:—

Q. Utrum idem modus genuflectendi³ servari etiam debeat a quolibet sacerdote qui, sive ad altare procedit missam celebraturus, sive redit celebrata missa, transit ante aliud altare in quo tunc Missa celebratur et est inter consecrationem et communionem?

The original reply was: 'Negative et servantur rubricae *De ritu celebrandi* tit. ii. n. 1.' In the recent volume⁴ of the *Decreta Authentica*, however, the following words are added: 'nisi ultro, scilicet nulla facta inquisitione, momentum advertatur.'

The priest, therefore, *as a general rule*, is to take no notice of a Mass that is being said at a side altar. For, according to the rubric referred to in the reply, he should proceed on his way 'dimissis oculis' and is not to look about him for the purpose of discovering whether the Consecration has taken place. But *without violating this rubric* he may sometimes know that the celebrant of the Mass has consecrated and not communicated. He may, for instance, hear the *Pater Noster* or *Agnus Dei*, etc. In such a case 'ultro et nulla facta inquisitione momentum advertatur,' and he should genuflect, but only on one knee,⁵ and without taking off his biretta.

4. The priest should, as far as possible, be careful not to turn his back towards the Blessed Sacrament when exposed. Hence at the time mentioned he should stand a little towards the Gospel side. Wapelhorst⁶ says: 'Si Communio distribuenda sit, ad *Ecce Agnus Dei*, etc. *Domine non sum dignus*, etc., se retrahit ad cornu Evangelii.'

5. The *Confiteor*, *Misereatur*, *Indulgentiam*, etc., are said as

¹ *Ephem. Liturg.*, 1912, p. 327.

² *Decr. Auth.*, n. 4135, ad 2.

³ Sc. on one or both knees.

⁴ Vol. vi. p. 49.

⁵ *Ephem. Liturg.*, 1912, p. 329.

⁶ N. 73.

usual. After Communion has been distributed, when the priest has returned to the altar he says the *O Sacrum*. While purifying and drying his fingers he recites the versicle *Panem de coelo*, etc., (but does not add *Alleluia*), and the other versicles *Domine exaudi orationem meam*, *Dominus vobiscum*. The prayer is that for Paschal time, *Spiritus nobis*, etc. In former editions of the Ritual this prayer had the short conclusion, *Per Christum Dominum nostrum*; but in the new typical edition of the Roman Ritual (1913) it has the long conclusion, *Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Filium tuum, qui tecum vivit et regnat*, etc. And, of course, this conclusion is to be used in future. It was rather peculiar that while the prayer *Deus qui nobis* had the long conclusion the prayer for Paschal time had the short one. It should be remembered that both prayers have now the long conclusion. The omission of *Alleluia* in Paschal time, when Communion is distributed before a Requiem Mass, is not indicated in the Ritual itself. But a decree¹ of the Congregation of Rites has settled the point. The blessing is also to be omitted. Again, this is not stated in the Ritual, but an answer of the Congregation² has decided that such is the case.

6. The rubric of the Missal³ states that, in a Low Mass, the priest is to say the *Kyrie* at the centre of the altar. No exception is made for such ferial Masses as those mentioned by our correspondent. Hence the *Kyrie* is to be said at the centre of the altar and not at the Missal.⁴

7. In the new editions of the Breviary the lessons for the days within the Octave are arranged so as to begin with Thursday. But the order is otherwise the same. Hence the lessons which were formerly assigned for Monday are now to be said on Thursday; those for Tuesday are to be said on Friday, and so on.

PRAYERS AFTER MASS. COLOUR OF THE STOLE WHEN COMMUNION IS GIVEN 'EXTRA MISSAM'

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you be so kind as to answer the following:—

1. Considering that the present Pope has not formally confirmed the order of his predecessors, Pius X and Leo XIII, with regard to the English prayers we have now for some years been saying after Mass, are we justified in not saying these prayers?

2. When a priest in surplice and stole gives Communion outside of

¹ Decr. Auth., n. 3465.

² Ibid., n. 3792, ad 10.

³ *Ritus celebrandi missam*, iv. 2.

⁴ P. Viet. ab Appeltern, vol. i. p. 194.

Mass what should be the colour of the stole he is expected to use? Is there a rubric or decree justifying the wearing of a white stole, no matter what may be the colour of the day?

T. S.

1. Our correspondent seems to take it for granted that each succeeding Pope must renew the command to recite the Papal prayers after Mass. As far as we can learn there is no warrant for this assumption. Leo XIII commanded these prayers to be said 'in posterum.' The decree by which the prayers were rendered obligatory is a *law*, and remains in force until it is repealed. Hence we are still bound to say them in the circumstances for which they are prescribed.

2. The Roman Ritual lays down¹ that the stole should correspond in colour to that of the Office for the day—'superpelliceo indutus, ac desuper stola coloris Officio illius diei convenientis.' Notwithstanding this rubric many writers were inclined to hold that the colour should be white, as more suitable for the Blessed Sacrament. In the year 1836 the following question was asked²:—

An stola pro ministranda Sanctissima Eucharistia extra Missam esse debeat coloris Officio illius diei convenientis, ut praescribit Rituale Romanum; vel etiam esse possit alba, prout valde conveniens Sacramento Eucharistiae, ceu multi censent Doctores?

The answer then given was: 'Iuxta Ritualis Romani rubricam debet esse coloris Officio illius diei convenientis.' But in the latest edition of the Authentic Decrees this answer has been changed, and now we read: 'Affirmative ad utrumque.' According to the present legislation, therefore, the priest is at liberty to use either a white stole or, if the colour for the day is different, one of that colour. On the Commemoration of All Souls, however, a black stole must not be used, but either a white or a violet one.³

'ORATIO IMPERATA'—A CORRECTION

In the April (1915) issue of the I. E. RECORD we expressed an opinion that when three prayers are prescribed by the rubrics and two Collects are ordered by the Bishop the second of the Collects may be omitted. We did not advert at the time to an answer of the Congregation of Rites⁴ regarding this very point:—

Q. Utrum Collectae, si fuerint duae, ambae adjiciendae sint post tertiam praescriptam orationem; an una tantum?

R. Affirmative ad primam partem; negative ad secundam.

¹ Tit. iv. c. 2, n. 1.

² Decr. Auth., n. 2740, ad 12.

³ S.C.R., 19 April, 1912, ad x.

⁴ 22 March, 1912, ad xi.

Hence both Collects must be said. The fourth prayer in this case is not prescribed *by the rubrics*. The *Oratio imperata* would be omitted, however, if the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament, or for the Pope or Bishop on their respective anniversaries,¹ formed a fourth prayer, because these prayers are to be regarded as prescribed by the rubrics.

THOMAS O'DOHERTY.

¹ 21 June, 1912.

CORRESPONDENCE

'MEAT WINES

REV. DEAR SIR,—I received yesterday from the manufacturers a small sample bottle of a certain brand of so-called 'meat wine,' accompanied by laudatory testimonials, by the manufacturers' assurance that 'over 10,000 doctors regularly recommend and prescribe it to their patients,' and by a free order-form asking me, as a clergyman, to give them the name and address of any friend or acquaintance of mine to whom they might present a pint bottle of the wine *free of charge*. I have been assured by doctors that such free samples are being sent broadcast not only to the clergy and members of the medical profession, but to mothers whose names and addresses are obtained from the *births*' columns of the public Press.

In view of these facts I consider it my duty as a clergyman to state a few other facts for the information of your readers:—

First, all these 'meat wines' are highly intoxicating, containing as they do about 20 per cent. of alcohol: the particular variety sent to me contains 19·60 per cent.

Secondly, the official organs of the medical profession, the *Lancet* and the *British Medical Journal*, state that 'the idea that beef can be combined serviceably with wine is a delusion and a snare,' and that 'meat-and-malt wine is in fact a farce'—the reason being that the alcohol neutralises and counteracts the nutritive properties of the meat.

Thirdly, multitudes of leading medical men proclaim it as a notorious fact that the growing use of these 'tonics' by women in recent years on occasions of delicacy, and especially by young mothers after confinement—i.e., at times when the alcohol craving is most easily awakened and developed—has resulted in a lamentable increase in secret drinking and drunkenness among women.

Fourthly, the leading members of the medical profession are unanimous in condemning these forms of 'cloaked alcohol' as most dangerous and insidious. Sir James Barr says of them: 'They are an abomination, and the only people who derive any benefit from them are the individuals who foist them on the public.'

Professor Sims Woodhead describes them as 'a most pernicious institution,' and Sir Thomas Barlow calls on the profession to 'stamp upon these medicated wines.' Sir Arthur Chance says that the practice of using such wines 'is at once expensive, insidious, harmful, and dangerous. Expensive, because many of the concoctions are sold at prices exceeding the cost of good wine and good beef; insidious, because, masquerading under the title of medicine, these wines are taken, morning, noon, and night, at times when the sense of shame and the fear of public opinion would forbid the undisguised use of alcohol; insidious, also, because they are taken at those times when women are most prone to yield to temptation; dangerous—I speak from experience—because they are at the present day the most potent cause of intemperance in women. They are an unmixed evil.'

In view of these facts I trust that if priests do not feel called upon positively to discountenance the use of such concoctions among their people, they will at least not become agents for their dissemination. It is bad enough to have the country cursed with an excessive number of public-houses; it is still worse to have the Postal Service of the kingdom acting as a distributing agency to carry alcohol into the very homes of the people,—without enlisting the services even of the clergy themselves to increase inebriety and alcoholism throughout the country.

P. COFFEY.

FATHER MATHEW UNION,
MAYNOOTH COLLEGE, *May 1, 1915.*

DOCUMENTS

CASE OF EPISCOPAL REVENUES ACCRUING DURING THE VACANCY OF THE SEE, DECIDED BY THE CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL

(February 8, 1913)

[In this case, published on the 22nd January, 1915, it is decided whether the revenues of a vacant See should go to the Apostolic Administrator who presided over the diocese during the interval or to the episcopal successor.]

S. CONGREGATIO CONCILII

DIOECESIS N.

REDITUUM MENSÆ, SEDE VACANTE

Die 8 februarii 1913

Vacante sede episcopali dioecesis N. anno 1910, constitutus est Administrator Apostolicus, qui praefatae dioecesis regimen tenuit usque ad annum 1912, quo Episcopus successor possessionem cepit. Quum intermedio tempore fructus maturassent nonnullorum reddituum, quaesitum est num hi fructus ad Administratorem Apostolicum an potius ad Episcopum successorem spectarent; quod dubium dirimendum, utriusque nomine, ad hanc S. Congregationem Concilii detulit Vicarius generalis praefatae dioecesis.

Pro huius dubii solutione operae pretium visum est recolere in primis ad quem, iure communi spectato, pertineant redditus mensae episcopalis sede vacante. Qua in re fundamentalis habetur decretalis Alexandri III, c. *Cum vos*, 4, de off. iud. ord., ubi praecipitur sede vacante constituendos esse oeconomos, qui debeant 'fructus fideliter reservare.' Huius autem decretalis observantiam sub poena suspensionis urget Bonifacius VIII in cap. *Quia saepe contingit* 40, de elect., in VI, et Clemens V in Conc. Viennen., cap. *Statutum* 7, de elect. (Clem.) declarat statutum super bonis . . . futuris successoribus reservandis, locum habere in omni emolumento, quod provenit ex iurisdictione et sigillo curiae ecclesiasticae, aut alias undecumque, quod ad prae-

latos, ecclesiis non vacantibus, pertineret, consuetudine qualibet contraria non obstante; ita tamen quod in istis et in similibus rationabiles deducantur expensae.' De qua constitutione duo notanda sunt: 1° bona quae praelato successoribus reservantur, ea esse tantummodo, quae ad praelatum viventem pertinuisent: et ideo, si qua bona aut emolumenta, sede plena, ad vicarium generalem proprio jure spectassent, haec, sede vacante, ad vicarium capitulare pertinere; 2° redditus mensae episcopalis non intelligi nisi deductis rationabilibus expensis, et proinde ex his redditibus in primis constituendum et solvendum esse rationabile stipendium vicario capitulari, aut in genere, ei qui sedem vacantem administraverit.

Quae duo puncta, S. Congr. Concilii, ius commune interpretata, semper asseruit et confirmavit, ut constat v. g. ex una Cephaluden. 17 novemb. 1594; ex quadam Nullius, 11 iulii 1626; ex una Agrigent. 17 april. 1627, quas recolat Benedictus XV, *De Syn. dioec.* lib. X, cap. 10, n. 4; cfr. etiam Goan., 6 mart. 1847. Hinc apud doctores canonum hac de re doctrina constans et unanimis effecta est: cfr. Leurenus, *De Vic. Episc.* q. 465, n. 1; Monacelli, *Formular.* I, tit. 1, form. 2, n. 15; De Angelis, *Praelect.*, in tit. *de off. Vicar.*, num. 22, etc.

Notandum tamen est, ius commune hac in re limitatum et etiam immutatum nonnullis in regionibus fuisse, sive per reservationes pontificias, sive per pacta concordata cum potestate civili. Variis enim temporibus Romani Pontifices reservare coeperunt *Camerae Apostolicae* bona e beneficiis, etiam episcopalibus, vacantibus obvenientia. Sic Iulius III, Const. *Cupientes* diei 20 mart. 1554, S. Pius V, Const. *Emanarunt* diei 12 decemb. 1567 pro Hispania; sic etiam, ad normam reg. 2 Canc. Apost., Pius IV, Const. *Cupientes* diei 25 april. 1561 pro Italia, etc. De qua reservatione notandum, per fructus a die vacationis colligendos, venire etiam fructus die vacationis inexactos, ad normam Constit. Iulii III *Cum sicut* diei 6 iun. 1550, quam confirmavit Urbanus VIII Const. *Aeternus rerum Conditor*, die 5 april. 1628. Animadvertendum praeterea est, omnia bona et iura quae ad Cameram Apostolicam pertinebant, et proinde etiam bona beneficiorum episcopalium vacantium, 'eodem modo et forma, quibus ad Cameram Apostolicam pertinebant, S. Congregationi de Propaganda Fide' addicta et incorporata fuisse a Pio VII, per Constit. *Catholicae fidei* 19 iunii 1817 (Bull. Rom. contin. t. VII, p. 1473).

De pactis autem cum potestate civili concordatis casus de quo agitur nullam disputationem postulabat.

Maximi vero momenti visum est, ad commune ius quod attinet, in comperto ponere quomodo interpretanda sint verba Decretalium 'futuris personis fideliter reservare.' Ea profecto non possunt ita

intelligi, ut integrum sit immediato successori fructus durante vacatione collectos in proprios usus *quoscumque* libere convertere. Notissimum enim est omnes beneficiatos, sive maiores sive minores, ex lege generali, non posse de quibuslibet fructibus proprii beneficii pro seipsis impendere nisi quantum necessarium est ad honestam sustentationem. Quin immo evidenter patet ex Concilio Lateranensi Pontifice Alexandro III celebrato, ex cap. *Cum in officiis*, 7, de *testam.* et ex cap. *Relatum* 12 eod. tit., bona omnia ex beneficiis provenientia, quae supersint post honestam sustentationem beneficiati, spectare *ad ecclesiam*. ‘Nomine autem ecclesiae,’ sunt verba ipsius Alexandri III in cit. cap. *Relatum*, ‘non episcopus vel successor clerici morientis, sed communis congregatio intelligitur, quae rerum illarum debet canonicam distributionem et curam habere. Ubi autem in loco defuncti tantum unus est ordinandus, is ea bona (sicut et alia ipsius ecclesiae) in Dei timore dispenset.’

Contra, non pauci auctores magnam hac in re confusionem et aequivocationem invexerunt. Hos vero sapienter, more suo, corrigit praeclarus iurisconsultus card. De Luca in discept. centesima de *Beneficiis*, n. 22, ubi ait ‘Cum doctores materiam tractando praesupponant huiusmodi fructuum pertinentiam ad successorem, hinc frequentior opinatio est, non solum ignari ac inferioris vulgi, sed etiam forte litteratorum ac virorum superioris ordinis, quod huiusmodi fructus . . . ad ecclesiam vel successorem pertinentes, sint ipsius successoris, cuius fortunae referri solet invenire notabilem cumulum fructuum decursorum tempore vacationis. . . . Verum . . . videtur aequivocum clarum . . .; siquidem quoad alios [fructus] annorum praecedentium, eos exigere quidem poterit successor et administrare, *sed ad commodum ecclesiae, in augmentum eius dotis et bonorum*, cum ita speciem dotis principalis habere videantur, eodem modo quo hereditatem vel fidei commissum augent fructus, qui decurrunt intermedio tempore, quo successio, ob non existentiam personae vocatae, seu ob non purificatam conditionem, vacat, sive eandem hereditatem augent fructus maturati de tempore mortis testatoris.’

Huic praeclari iurisconsulti doctrinae inhaerendo, quae tum iustitiae, tum canonicae aequitati plane conformis apparet, enunciati fructus investiendi essent favore mensae episcopalis, et consequenter favore hodierni Episcopi et aliorum successorem.

Verum huic conclusioni obstare in casu videbantur supra citatae Constitutiones Pontificiae, quarum vi fructus e bonis ecclesiarum seu beneficiorum vacantium spectabant olim ad Cameram Apostolicam, et nunc spectarent ad sacram Congregationem de Propaganda Fide; aliunde, autem, prae oculis habendae erant peculiares quaedam circumstantiae, in quibus versabatur Episcopus successor.

Quibus praehabitis, quum in plenario coetu diei 8 februarii 1913 causa proposita fuisset, Eñi Patres rescribendum censuerunt :

‘ Attentis omnibus rerum adiunctis in casu concurrentibus, dimidiam partem fructuum caute et utiliter investiendam esse favore mensae episcopalis ; dimidiam autemtribuendam esse Episcopo successori, *facto verbo cum Ss̃mo.*’

O. GIORGI, *Secretarius.*

LETTER OF BENEDICT XV TO THE BISHOPS OF AMERICA CONCERNING THE SPIRITUAL CARE OF ITALIAN EMIGRANTS

(February 22, 1915)

S. CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

LITTERAE CIRCULARES

AD R.MOS. AMERICAЕ ORDINARIOS, DE EMIGRANTIUM ITALORUM CURA

Cum in varias Americae regiones centena Italorum millia quotannis emigrare consuescant, factum est ut multa loca et civitates iisdem repleta sint.

Hi autem, catholici quum sint, etiamsi temporaneum dumtaxat domicilium in America sibi constituent, iuxta tamen divinas et ecclesiasticas leges, dum ibi commorantur, curae et sollicitudini stant Ordinariorum loci. Quorum propterea est satagere ut congrua spiritualia subsidia tantae multitudini non desint, ne tot animae divino sanguine redemptae misere pereant, et res catholica tum in America tum in Italia magnum detrimentum patiatur.

Equidem quamplurimi Rñi Episcopi, officii sui conscii, omninisu conati sunt in hunc finem adlaborare, et multam laudem coram Deo et Ecclesia idcirco meriti sunt. Verum res difficultatibus plena est. Nam in primis emigrantes magna ex parte agricolae sunt et operarii, rudes plerumque et ingenui ; ideoque insidiis et malis artibus perfidorum, eo facilius obnoxii fiunt quo in religiosis disciplinis minus sunt exculti.

Accedit quod hi, etsi aliqua communiora localis linguae vocabula pro urgentioribus vitae necessitatibus cito addiscant, ad eius plenam cognitionem vix numquam perveniunt ; unde a sacramentali confessione peragenda impediuntur, nec verbi divini praedicatione aut catechismi explanatione roborari possunt, nisi sacerdotes praesto habeant qui italicam linguam noverint et quandoque etiam vernaculi alicuius italicae provinciae sermonis sint gnari ; quos tamen invenire et praebere nec pronum est neque expeditum.

Denique emigrantes, de quibus sermo, solent non in unum confluere locum, nec semper ubi templa et sacerdotes catholici inveniuntur, sed huc illuc discurrunt, ubi operam et mercedem inveniunt :

quo fit ut difficilior opem et auxilium eisdem praestari possit, et ipsi, spiritualibus subsidiis destituti, facilius corruptelarum illecebris falsisque doctrinis irretiantur.

His itaque de causis factum est plura centena hominum millia etiam inter fideles ex Italia immigratos, iuxta sententiam illorum qui ethnographicis studiis se addicunt, ultimis hisce annis cum magno Ecclesiae luctu naufragium in fide passa sunt.

Tanto avertendo malo unicum remedium est numerum et operam augere illorum sacerdotum qui, zelo et pietate ferventes, italicae linguae et, si opus sit, etiam vernaculi sermonis periti, italorum emigrantium curae se devoveant.

In quem finem Summus Pontifex Pius X s. m. Motu Proprio *Iampridem* diei 19 martii 1914 sacerdotum collegium in Urbe instituendum decrevit, in quo iuvenes sacerdotes alerentur et opportunis pietatis, legum et linguarum exercitiis aptarentur, ut praesto esse possent Americae Ordinariis in italorum immigrantium subsidium.

Ssm̃us autem D. N. Benedictus XV inter primas sui Pontificatus curas illud quoque recensuit ut huic collegio proprias opportunasque aedes destinaret et suppetias ab Italiae Episcopis peteret ad expensas pro hoc collegio obeundas, datis idcirco per S. Congregationem Consistorialem, die 6 decembris 1914, opportunis litteris. Ehu! saeviente bello, quod tantam mundi partem cruentat, cui accessit in Italia horrenda nuperrimi terraemotus clades, modica hucusque prolata sunt subsidia. Verum si christiana caritas pro fide in barbaras nationes propaganda adeo genere succurrit, pro fide in suis filiis conservanda credere oportet non esse defuturam.

Ut autem S. Sedis studia hac in re Rm̃i Americae Episcopi ob oculos habeant, huic epistolae adiungitur exemplar Motus Proprii *Iampridem*, litterarum S. huius Congregationis diei 6 decembris 1914 et Decreti *Ethnographica studia*; et italorum immigratorum causa, quae et Italiae et futurae Americae sortis tanti interest eorum pietati et devotioni commendatur.

Romae, die 22 februarii 1915.

C. CARD. DE LAI, *Secretarius*.

P. PISANI, *Substitutus pro Emigr.*

L. ✠ S.

DOUBTS REGARDING THE POWER OF ORDINARIES TO PERMIT THE CELEBRATION OF MASS IN PRIVATE HOUSES

(March 22, 1915)

[The questions proposed were (1) Can Ordinaries, for just and reasonable causes, permit the celebration of Mass *per modum actus* in private houses? (2) Can they do so in favour of those who enjoy the privilege of a private oratory on days excepted in the indult

granting the privilege? The answer to each question is in the affirmative, but, in the latter case, the just and reasonable causes presupposed must be different from those on account of which the indult was granted.]

S. CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM
MELITEN

DUBIORUM CIRCA ORDINARIORUM FACULTATEM PERMITTENDI
CELEBRATIONEM MISSAE PER MODUM ACTUS

In generali eminentissimorum ac reverendissimorum huius S. Congregationis Patrum Cardinalium Conventu die 20 mensis martii 1915 habito, sequentia dubia super Ordinariorum facultate permittendi celebrationem Missae per modum actus ('Acta Apostolicae Sedis'; *Romana et aliarum. Iurium*. Vol. IV, p. 725) proposita sunt :

I. An Ordinarii ex iustis et rationabilibus causis, servatisque de iure servandis, permittere possint per modum actus celebrationem Missae, domi, quocumque die.

II. An Ordinarii ex iustis et rationabilibus causis, servatisque de iure servandis, permittere possint per modum actus celebrationem Missae, domi, eorum favore qui domestici Oratorii indulto gaudent, etiam iis diebus qui in obtento indulto excepti sunt.

Et eminentissimi ac reverendissimi Patres, universis mature perpensis, respondendum censuerunt :

Ad I. Affirmative.

Ad II. Affirmative, dummodo iustae et rationabiles causae aliae sint ab eis, ob quas concessum fuit indultum Oratorii domestici.

Quae responsa Ss^{mus} Dominus noster Benedictus PP. XV in audientia habita ab infra scripto Secretario die 22 martii 1915 rata habere et confirmare dignatus est.

Datum Romae, e Secretaria huius S. Congregationis, die 22 martii 1915.

PHILIPPUS CARD. GIUSTINI, *Praefectus*.

✠ ALOISIUS CAPOTOSTI, Ep. Therm., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

DOUBT AS TO THE CALENDAR TO BE FOLLOWED IN A
CERTAIN METROPOLITAN CHURCH

(March 20, 1915)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM
VERAPOLITANA

DUBIUM

Archiepiscopus Verapolitanus sacrae Rituum Congregationi pro opportuna declaratione haec quae sequuntur reverenter exposuit :

In loco Verapoly exstat Ecclesia Metropolitana, mater omnium

ecclesiarum archidioecesis Verapolitanae, in qua tamen Religiosi Carmelitani Discalceati, qui ibi residentiam habent, sua officia et sacras functiones exercent, necnon et fidelium curae per verbi divini praeconium et administrationem sacramentorum deserviunt.

Hinc quaeritur : An in Ecclesia Metropolitana Verapoly Kalendarium regulare Ordinis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum servari debeat, iuxta decreta S. R. C. 4150 Ratisbonen. 27 ianuarii 1905 et 4252 Secovien. 22 aprilis 1910, vel Kalendarium Dioecesanum ab Apostolica Sede rite approbatum ?

Et sacra Rituum Congregatio, exquisita specialis Commissionis sententia, omnibus sedulo perpensis proposito dubio respondendum censuit : Negative ad primam partem ; et decreta in medium allata non respiciunt ecclesias Cathedrales aut Metropolitanas : Affirmative ad secundam. Atque ita rescripsit et declaravit die 20 martii 1915.

ANTONIUS CARD. VICO, S. R. C. *Pro-Praefectus*.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, Ep. Charystien., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

LETTER OF BENEDICT XV TO DR. IRELAND, ARCHBISHOP OF ST. PAUL'S, MINNESOTA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF A NEW CATHEDRAL

(*March 15, 1915*)

AD R. P. D. IOANNEM IRELAND, ARCHIEPISCOPUM S. PAULI DE MINNESOTA, DE NOVA AEDE CATHEDRALI PAULOPOLI PROPEDIEM DEDICANDA.

Venerabilis Frater, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.— Cum tu novae cathedralis aedis, in ista honoris tui sede, initia poneres, scimus decessorem Nostrum fel. rec. Pium X, datis ad te litteris die xx mensis aprilis anno mcmiv, tum laudes tibi, venerabilis Frater, tribuisse ac piis hominibus qui suis te opibus adiuvarent, tum hortamenta ad peragendum inceptum adiecisse. Nunc certiores facti sumus aedificationi iam esse fastigium impositum, eamque, excepto interiore ornatu, omni ex parte sic absolutam, ut ipsius dedicatio sollemnis in diem undecimum proximi mensis aprilis constituta sit ; eiusmodi autem excitatum esse templum, ut et amplitudine et magnificentia et formae elegantia insigne dici posse videatur. Haec Nos perlibenter intelligentes, facere non possumus, quin omnes, quotquot ad rei successum contulerunt aliquid, eos praesertim qui, pro suo Religionis amore, egregie se munificos praestarent, dilaudemus. Tibi vero, qui cum in omni pastoralis officii munere virtutem praeclare actuosam ostendere consueveris, tum in hoc ipso declarasti quam decorem Domus Dei diligeres, in primis gratulamur instantiam curasque tuas e sententia successisse. Auspex autem caelestium bonorum ac testis paternae

benevolentiae Nostrae sit, venerabilis Frater, apostolica benedictio, quam tibi eisque omnibus quos memoravimus, atque etiam reliquo tuo clero ac populo amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XIV mensis martii MCMXV, Pontificatus Nostri anno primo.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

LETTER OF BENEDICT XV TO HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL GIBBONS, ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE, IN PRAISE OF THE CHARITY OF THE CATHOLICS OF THE UNITED STATES TOWARDS THE AFFLICTED PEOPLE OF MEXICO

(March 17, 1915)

AD JACOBUM CARD. GIBBONS, BALTIMORENSEM ARCHIEPISCOPUM, EXIMIAM CARITATEM LAUDAT CATHOLICORUM FOEDERATARUM AMERICAЕ CIVITATUM ERGA MISEROS NATIONIS MEXICANAЕ INCOLAS, CIVILIBUS PERTURBATIONIBUS VEXATOS

Dilecte Fili Noster, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Certiores quotidie de iis reddimur, quibus catholici praesertim Foederatarum Americae Civitatum, praeunte venerabili Episcopatu, votis Nostris obsecundantes, contendunt moerorem damnumque mitigare, quibus tot fratres nationis Mexicanae iam dudum premuntur ob civiles perturbationes regionem illam catholicam devexantes.

Illud praesertim scimus, caritatem hanc fraternam patuisse actuosam eandemque multiplicem, scilicet subsidio ephemeridum, conventuum, subscriptionum, collectarum et omne genus beneficiorum coeptum; qua caritate excitati fuere quotquot sive ob spectatam civilem conditionem sive censum, sive praecipue animi nobilitatem ingenique praestantiam, maximi momenti causae suppetias quomodolibet ferre possent.

Quo factum est, ut Pastores animarum optime meriti, sacerdotes et utriusque sexus claustrales, patria extorres, tuto hospitio humanisque curis iuvare potuerint, et (quod Nobis maxime gratum fuit) in seminarium colligi pauperes ephebi mexicani, in sacerdotii spem educandi. Atque ita manifestari coepit penes omnes in hisce regionibus ille amor, eaque cura et tutela in exules, quae perpulcros inter fastos rei christianae et civilis in America accensebitur.

Inter multos, qui pio huic operi adlaborarunt, indigitare heic placet, praeter te, dilectum Filium Nostrum, duosque Patres Cardinales, qui eodem, ac tu magnanimitatis merito praestant, venerabiles Fratres Archiepiscopos Chicagensem et Novae-Aureliae una cum Episcopis Campifontis, Matanzensi, Toletano, S. Christophori de Habana et S. Antonii iam a Nobis laudato; nec non dilectos Filios sac. Franciscum C. Kelley, praesidem *Catholic Church Extension*

Society et religiosum virum Recaredum Tierney, S.I., diarii *The America Press* moderatorem.

Quibus omnibus ceterisque dum laudis testimonium et incitamentum adiungimus, spes Nobis adridet fore, ut iidem et quotquot exstant penes nos Christi fideles 'corde magno et animo volenti' salutare opus efficaciter prosequantur ac foveant quousque (quod quantocius eventurum confidimus) civilis ordo et christiana libertas in dilectissima Mexicana republica instaurentur.

Auspicem interim caelestium bonorum Nostraeque benevolentiae testem tibi, dilecto Filio Nostro tuaeque archidiocesi universae benedictionem apostolicam peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die xvii martii mcmxv, Pontificatus Nostri anno primo.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

DECREE PROHIBITING THE USE OF SECULAR OR FAMILY TITLES AND DEVICES IN THE INSCRIPTIONS AND ARMS OF BISHOPS

(January 15, 1915)

S. CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

DECRETUM

DE VETITIS NOBILITATIS FAMILIARIS TITULIS ET SIGNIS IN
EPISCOPORUM INSCRIPTIONIBUS ET ARMIS

Apostolica constitutione, cuius initium *Militantis Ecclesiae* die 19 decembris 1644 data, Summus Pontifex Innocentius X mandavit ut 'omnes S. R. E. Cardinales, ad unitatem et aequalitatem ordinis construendam, iubeant e propriis sigillis et insignibus quibuscumque, vulgo *armis* nuncupatis, amoveri coronas, signa ac omnes notas saeculares, praeter eas quibus intra scutum armorum eorum familiae tamquam de essentia et integritate eorundem armorum utuntur, et ut in posterum ab illorum usu abstineant.' Ad unam vero eandemque rationem hac in re etiam quoad Episcopos inducendam Ss̃mus D. N. Benedictus Papa XV legem, quae supra relata est, ad eos extendendam opportunum censuit. Quapropter Sanctitas Sua hoc edi iussit consistoriale decretum, quo Patriarchae, Archiepiscopi et Episcopi omnes tam residentiales quam titulares in posterum in suis sigillis et insignibus seu armis, itemque in edictorum inscriptionibus, titulos nobiliare, coronas, signa aliasque notas saeculares, quae nobilitatem propriae familiae vel gentis ostendant, addere penitus prohibentur, nisi forte dignitas aliqua saecularis ipsi episcopali aut archiepiscopali sedi sit adnexa; aut nisi agatur de ordine

equestri S. Ioannis Hierosolymitani aut Ss̃mi Sepulchri. Contrariis non obstantibus quibusvis.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria S. Congregationis Consistorialis, die 15 ianuarii 1915.

L. ✠ S. ✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, Episc., Sabinen. *Secretarius*.
 ✠ FR. THOMAS BOGGIANI, *Adessor*.

CERTAIN WORKS ARE PUT ON THE INDEX OF
PROHIBITED BOOKS

(April 12, 1915)

S. CONGREGATIO INDICIS

I

DECRETUM

Feria II, die 12 aprilis 1915

Sacra Congregatio eminentissimorum ac reverendissimorum sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalium a sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papa XV sanctaque Sede Apostolica Indici librorum pravae doctrinae, eorumdemque proscriptioni ac permissioni in universa christiana republica praepositorum et delegatorum, habita in palatio Apostolico Vaticano die 12 aprilis 1915, damnavit et damnat, proscripsit proscribitque, atque in Indicem librorum prohibitorum referri mandavit et mandat quae sequuntur opera :

CYRILLOS MACAIRE, *La Constitution divine de l'Eglise*. Genève, 1913.

PHILIPP FUNK, *Von der Kirche des Geistes*. Religiöse Essays in Sinne eines modernen Katholizismus. München, 1913.

ALPHONSE SALTZMANN, *Les remèdes divins pour l'âme et le corps*. Paris-Bruxelles, 1912.

PIERRE DE COULEVAIN, *Le roman merveilleux*. Paris, s. a.

Itaque nemo, cuiuscumque gradus et conditionis, praedicta opera damnata atque proscripta, quocumque loco et quocumque idiomate, aut in posterum edere, aut edita legere vel retinere audeat, sub poenis in Indice librorum vetitorum indictis.

Quibus sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papae XV per me infrascriptum Secretarium relatis, Sanctitas Sua decretum probavit et promulgari praecepit. In quorum fidem, etc.

Datum Romae, die 14 aprilis 1915.

L. ✠ S. FR. CARD. DELLA VOLPE, *Praefectus*.
 THOMAS ESSER, O.P., *Secretarius*.

II

Damianus Avancini et Theodorus Wacker decreto huius S. Congregationis, quo quidam eorum libri prohibiti sunt, se subiecerunt.

In quorum fidem, etc.

THOMAS ESSER, O.P., *Secretarius*.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

THE OFFICE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, THE OFFICE FOR THE DEAD, AND THE NEW OFFICE FOR NOVEMBER 2, TOGETHER WITH OTHER PIOUS EXERCISES FOR THE USE OF COMMUNITIES. New Edition, Revised in accordance with the Latest Rubrics and Decrees, by Very Rev. T. Canon O'Doherty, B.D., St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Dublin: Browne & Nolan, Ltd.

BOTH editor and printer have done their part in making the above work as perfect as possible. Canon O'Doherty's eminent position as a liturgist secures for it complete accuracy and conformity with the latest decrees, whilst Messrs. Browne and Nolan have given it a format which makes it pleasant to handle, and have printed it in a type which can be read with the greatest comfort.

P. M. MACS.

LIFE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON. By Very Rev. James O'Boyle, B.A., P.P., V.F. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

IT was a happy thought which led the author of the above work to present to the general reader a clear and succinct account of the great founder of American Independence. In an illuminating introduction Father O'Boyle points out the application of the life of Washington to present-day events. He believes that the key to world-peace is to be found in a federation, based upon the principles of human liberty and of Christian morality, which were the guiding ones in the lives of the founders of the American Commonwealth; and in this connexion he truly points out the danger which modern America runs through the non-observance of the Christian ideal of life. However, he trusts that ultimately the powerful influence of the Catholic Church will help to conserve for America the splendid ideals with which she started on her career as a nation. Some of his readers may not see their way to hope for a solution of European troubles along the lines of an International Federation. Certainly if it were a solution it would be much to be desired; but the conditions in Europe now are very different from those obtaining

in America at the end of the eighteenth century. Europe, with its stereotyped divisions, its ancient and diverse nations, its variety of tongues, religions, races, economic conditions, is an apparently irreducible conglomerate before which the most enthusiastic world-socialist, even, may quail. Father O'Boyle is, however, right when he appeals to the sense of Christian brotherhood amongst men as a means of quelling the inhuman lust for power. He is right in pointing out that that lust for power has been fortified by a philosophical system which is opposed to the central dignity of the human soul and the freedom of the individual; and it is in so far as the Life of Washington is a lesson in that dignity and in that freedom that its study is of real value just now. That study is made easy by Father O'Boyle's lucid and enthusiastic Life of his hero. It is one of the best popular expositions of the subject we have met with, and we trust that it will meet with all the success which it truly deserves. Without in any way detracting from its merits as a work for mature readers, we may be pardoned if we also point out its suitability as a work for schools. Lives, such as that of George Washington, are those which attract and elevate young minds, and stamp them with that idealism which is such an antidote to the corrosive effects of present-day materialism. The book is excellently printed, and furnished with admirable illustrations, including a facsimile of the signatures to the Declaration of American Independence.

P. M. MACSWEENEY.

THE GOSPEL OF NICODEMUS AND KINDRED DOCUMENTS. Translated, with an Introduction, by the Rev. Arthur Westcott, M.A. London: Heath, Granton, and Ouseley, Ltd.

THE *Gospel of Nicodemus* includes two distinct works—(a) the *Gesta Pilati* or *Acta Pilati*, and (b) the *Descensus Christi ad inferos*. The first of these appears alone in the oldest Greek codices. The Latin codices, however, always present the two works in combination under the title (at least after the eighth century) *Evangelium Nicodemi*. The second work was not originally intended to accompany the first, for there are discrepancies between the two. The *Descensus* seems to have been 'edited' so as to fit it to serve as a sequel to the *Gesta*, but the work of adapting has been clumsily done.

The Acts of Pilate is a history of the trial of Jesus before Pilate, and of the various attestations and proofs of Christ's resurrection which would best serve for apologetic purposes in the Early Church. The author of the Acts is claimed in the text to have been Nicodemus,

and from this circumstance is derived the title, 'Gospel of Nicodemus.' Nicodemus wrote, the text says, in Hebrew, and Aenias translated the story into Greek. It is known that a document entitled the 'Acts of Pilate' was current in the early Christian period. Justin Martyr seems to refer to it (*Apolog.*, i. 35) and it is alluded to by other early writers (Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, 2, 2). Mr. Westcott does not undertake, however, to show that our *Gesta Pilati* is the same as the text referred to by Justin. It is certain, however, that our *Gesta Pilati* is a very ancient document. It goes back probably beyond the beginning of the fourth century. It is not to be regarded as merely a pious legend of ancient Christianity. Its extraordinary sanity and its close adherence to the Biblical text make it at least probable that some reliable tradition is enshrined in it. The *Descensus* is an account of Christ's appearance in Limbo, which is alleged to have been written by two men who had arisen from the dead with Christ. These men were Karinus and Leucius, sons of the Simeon who had sung the *Nunc Dimittis*. It is a much less valuable document than the *Gesta*. Its atmosphere appears to be slightly Gnostic. It is also an ancient document, for it was used by Eusebius of Alexandria.

Mr. Westcott has given us with the Gospel of Nicodemus numerous texts from the Pilate-literature which was so abundant in the early Middle Ages: (a) the *Epistola Pilati* to the Emperor Claudius, which is appended to the *De. census* in many codices; (b) *Epistola Pontii Pilati*, an apology for his condemnation of Jesus, written by Pilate to Tiberius; (c) the *Anaphora Pilati*, which is an official report concerning the condemnation, death, and resurrection of Christ, addressed to Augustus; (d) the *Paradosis Pilati*, the Surrender of Pilate, an account of Pilate's appearance before the Emperor, his confession of injustice and his execution; (e) the *Mors Pilati*, a strange story of the cure of the Emperor by means of Veronica's wondrous picture of Christ's face, and of the rescue of Pilate from the Cæsar's wrath by the seamless robe of Jesus; (f) the *Narratio* of Joseph of Arimathea, a narrative of the events connected with the Passion, intended largely to glorify the memory of Demas, the Penitent Thief; (g) the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, an ancient but awkward account of Vespasian's campaign against Jerusalem, in which Veronica appears prominently.

None of these texts, except the *Gesta Pilati*, has any real historical value. But all of them give very interesting glimpses of the early and medieval Christian mind, and all of them have had a very great influence on European literature and on Christian art. Mr. Westcott has traced the presence of their influence in early English literature and legend, and has indicated, in a very brief way, some

of the artistic products of which they were the inspiration. Mr. Westcott's work will be of much service to the general public which is interested in the spiritual outlook of the ancient Church, but has not time or opportunity for close study or research.

P. BOYLAN.

PRE-REFORMATION SCHOLARS IN SCOTLAND IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. By W. Forbes Leith, S.J. Glasgow: James MacLehose & Sons.

As a motto for this book Fr. Forbes Leith has chosen the following from Sir William Hamilton's *Discussions on Philosophy*: 'A list of the Scottish scholars driven from the land at the Reformation for their attachment to the Roman Catholic Faith would form an exceedingly interesting chapter of Scottish literary history.' Whilst individuals, like Sir William Hamilton, may be found here and there, whose culture and learning are sufficient to prevent them accepting the cant common amongst Protestants about the Reformation and its beneficent effects upon the ages of Darkness which preceded it, it is none the less true that in England and Scotland that is the accepted way of looking upon the great religious change in the sixteenth century. And such a view finds favour not alone amongst the unlearned but also amongst such learned men as Andrew Lang. It is very hard to kill a popular error, especially when that error ministers to present-day pride and bigotry. If anything, however, should upset the comfortable doctrine that the Pre-Reformation period was an age of Darkness and the Reformation period an age of Light, it is the publication of such a volume as the present one. Father Forbes Leith confines his inquiry to the last decades of the existence of the ancient Church of Scotland (1500-1560). Even within the limits of this restricted period abundant evidence is given of the superiority of Catholic education and Catholic culture in Scotland. Besides the four universities, of Catholic institution, there were numerous grammar schools, so numerous that in 1496 an Act of Parliament made it compulsory for all persons of a certain social position to send their eldest sons to them. Amongst the many names recorded in this book as representatives of Scottish learning of the period we may select the following: in Poetry William Dunbar and Gawain Douglas, the one a priest and the other a Bishop; Robert Henryson, 'Chaucer's aptest and brightest scholar'; in Classical scholarship, Hector Boece, Bishop David Panter, Florence Wilson, and, above all, Buchanan, Gawain Douglas, John Erskine of Dun, John Row, John Leslie, Henry Scrimgeour, Edward Henryson, and Friar Alexander of the

Observantine Order. At the University of Bordeaux William Hegate and Robert Balfour taught Philosophy, whilst at the same university John Cameron was famous amongst foreign scholars for his perfect mastery of Greek. As in Polite Learning so also in Law and Architecture Scotland has its roll of distinguished names. It must be remembered that the present work deals with a limited period, but it follows that, if within such a restricted area so many names of important Catholic contributors to learning can be garnered, how much more forcibly could the argument be advanced were a wider field surveyed. Besides its value as a controversial work, Father Forbes Leith's volume is a valuable addition to our knowledge of the development of the Renaissance in these islands.

P. M. MacS.

A BOOK OF ENGLISH MARTYRS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. By E. M. Wilmot-Buxton. London: Burns and Oates.

THOUGH the primary intention of the author in writing this book has been to make Catholic children familiar with the story of the English martyrs in the reign of Henry VIII and Elizabeth, it is none the less a book which will interest older readers very much. It is just the right kind of popularisation of things hidden away in more learned tomes. The style is simple and is conceived in the manner of the age with which it deals. The titles of the chapters sufficiently indicate the matter of the book: The Execution of Margaret Pole, The Road to Tyburn, Blessed Thomas More, The English Terror, Papists and Heretics, The Northern Rising and its Effects, The Excommunication, Increase in Persecution, The First-fruits of the Jesuit Mission, Blessed Ralph Sherwin, The York Martyrs, A Group of Lay Martyrs, The Martyrs of 1588, Philip, Earl of Arundel, 'Come Rack, Come Rope!' Strength in Weakness. In a way we are indebted to the powerful influence of Mgr. Benson's historical romances for this renewed interest in the religious life of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and it is high praise for Miss Wilmot-Buxton's work when we say that her various chapters could be transferred to the fascinating pages of the late Mgr. Benson's novels without suffering by comparison. It is a work well suited to awake heroic feelings of attachment to the Faith in the breasts of young Catholic readers, and we heartily welcome it as a most suitable addition not only to the libraries in our Catholic elementary and secondary schools, but to the library of every Catholic, no matter how learned he or she may be.

P. M. MacS.

MEMORIALS OF ROBERT HUGH BENSON. By Blanche Warre Cornish, Shane Leslie, and Other Friends. London: Burns & Oates.

THIS slight book contains some delicately worded appreciations of the late Mgr. Benson. It reveals to us not only some of the sources of his fascination as a writer, but also as a man. Perhaps the adjective which his brother loved to apply to him—adventurous—indicates best the dominant trait in his character. He was a literary knight-errant, loving to espouse apparently lost causes, loving to penetrate the mysterious borderland of spiritual romance. Even for us, Catholics, he evoked something of the wondrous dignity, chivalry, and mystery which is the historical setting of our religion; and it may be truly said that he lived what he thought and what he imagined. Let us pray that the ideals for which he fought so valiantly here have found, for him, their perfect realisation in the world beyond.

P. M. MACS.

FREQUENT COMMUNION. A Course of Six Lenten Sermons. Rev. A. Chwala, O.M.I. New York: J. F. Wagner. 1915.

THESE excellent discourses will be read with great profit. In simple and forcible language they convey the teaching of our late Holy Father Pius IX. Father Chwala's book is evidently the product of experience on the mission. In many homes it will supply the place of a preacher, and by its means those persons who, from any cause whatever, are precluded from hearing a sermon in church, will be enabled to learn in private what is of inestimable advantage to their souls.

M.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

The Universe; A Catholic Weekly (May). London: Associated Catholic Newspapers, Ltd., Arundel Street.

America; A Catholic Review (May).

The Ecclesiastical Review (May). U.S.A.

The Rosary Magazine (May). Somerset, Ohio.

The Catholic World (May). New York.

The Austral Light (April). Melbourne.

The Ave Maria (April). Notre Dame, Indiana.

The Irish Monthly (May). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Month (May). London: Longmans.

Our Boys (May). Edited by Christian Brothers, Dublin.

Histoire Anecdotique de la Guerre de 1914-1915. Par Franc-Nohain et Paul Delay. Paris: Lethielleux.

Prayers of the Gael. By R. MacCróicoigh. (Translation of the Collection of Miss Charlotte Dease, entitled *Páidreacha na nDaoine*). London: Sands & Co.; St. Louis, Mo.: Herder.

Men, not Angels. By Katharine Tynan. London: Burns & Oates.

The Catholic Bulletin (May). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The African Missionary (May-June). Cork: Guy & Co.

The Annals of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart. Cork: Guy & Co.

Missionary Record of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Lamp (April). Garrison (N.Y.): The Lamp.

The Teacher's Magazine (April). New York: Hammock & Co.

Friends and Apostles of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By P. J. Chandlery, S.J. London: Washbourne.

The Mad Knight. By Otto von Schaching. New York: Benziger.

Miralda. By K. M. Johnston. New York: Benziger.

La Question Religieuse la France Pendant la Guerre de 1914. Documents (Première Ser. Août-Oct., 1914). Paris: Lethielleux.

Catholic Truth Society (London) Publications: *Thoughts in War Time*, by Right Rev. Mgr. Ward, and *Thy People at War*, by Rev. Edwin Burton, D.D.; *A Simple Prayer-book for Soldiers; War, Sin, and Suffering*, by Rev. H. Koos, O.P.; *How to Follow the Mass* (for Non-Catholics), by Rev. F. E. Pritchard; *Antonio Rosmini*, by the Rev. D. Hickey; *A Simple Mass and Communion Book*; *A Little Book of Prayers and Hymns, specially intended for Soldiers*; *Some Stories of the War*; *Some Children of St. Dominic*, by Marie St. S. Ellerker; *Lacordaire and Montalembert*, by M. M. C. Calthrop; *Fasting and Abstinence*, by Rev. A. Ross; *The University of Louvain*, by Rev. J. G. Vance.

Australian Catholic Truth Society Publications: *The Kultur Kampf*, by Dr. G. Baldwin; *Some Christmas Letters*, by 'Miriam Agatha'; *Church Music in New Zealand*, by M. C. Callan; *The Mass: a Liturgical Drama*, by Rev. W. Devine, B.A., B.D.

100

